Magistri Petri Lombardi
Arch. Episc. Parisiensis

Sententiarum Quatuor Libri

LIBER PRIMUS SENTENTIARUM.

DE DEI UNITATE ET TRINITATE

DISTINCTIO XIV.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 242-243.
Cum Notitiis Editorum Quaracchi

Cap. I.

De gemina processione Spiritus sancti, temporali et aeterna.

Praeterea diligenter adnotandum[1] est, quod gemina est processio Spiritus sancti, aeterna videlicet, quae ineffabilis est, qua a Patre et Filio aeternaliter et sin tempore processit, et temporalis, qua a Patre et Filio ad sanctificandam creaturam procedit. Et sicut ab aeterno communiter ac simul procedit a Patre et Filio, ita et in tempore communiter et simul ab utroque procedit ad creaturam. Unde Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[2] ait: « Spiritus sanctus non de Patre procedit in Filium et de Filio procedit ad sanctificandam creaturam, sed simul de utroque procedit; quamvis hoc Filio Pater dederit, ut sicut de se, ita etiam de illo procedat ».

De temporali autem processione Beda in homilia Domincae primae post Ascensionem[3] ita loquitur: « Cum Spiritus sancti gratia datur hominibus, profecto mittitur Spiritus a Patre, mittitur et a Filio; procedit a Patre, procedit et a Filio, quia et eius missio est ipsa processio ». His verbis aperte ostendit, donationem gratiae Spiritus sancti dici processionem vel missionem eiusdem. Sed cum donatio vel[4] datio non sit nisi temporalis, constat, quia et haec processio sive missio temporalis est. Hanc quoque temporalem Spiritus sancti

Master Peter Lombard
Archbishop of Paris

The Four Books of Sentences

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE SENTENCES

ON THE UNITY AND TRINITY OF GOD

DISTINCTION 14

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 242-243.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Chapter I

On the twin procession of the Holy Spirit, the temporal and eternal.

Moreover it must be diligently noted down [adnotandum],[1] that there is a twin procession of the Holy Spirit, namely, the eternal, which is ineffable, by which He proceeds from the Father and the Son eternally and without time, and the temporal, by which He proceeds from the Father and the Son to sanctify a creature. And just as He proceeds from eternity, commonly and at once, from the Father and the Son, so also in time, commonly and at once, from Each He proceeds to a creature Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book On the Trinity[2] says: « The Holy Spirit does not proceed from [de] the Father unto the Son and from the Son to sanctify a creature, but proceeds at once from Each; though this the Father has given to the Son, that just as from Himself, so also from Him does (the Holy Spirit) proceed ».

Moreover, of the temporal procession (St.) Bede (the Venerable) speaks thus in (his) Homily for the First Sunday after the Ascension:[3] « When the grace of the Holy Spirit is given to men, the Spirit is indeed sent from [a] the Father, He is also sent from the Son; He proceeds from the Father, He proceeds also from the Son, because His being sent [missio] is the procession itself ». With these words he openly shows, that the donation of the grace of the Holy Spirit is said (to be) the procession and/or mission of the Same. But since the donation and/or[4]

processionem Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate insinuat[5] dicens, Spiritum sanctum processisse a Christo, quando post resurrectionem insufflavit in discipulos, his verbis: « Cum resurrexisset Christus a mortuis et apparisset discipulis, insufflavit et ait:[6] *Accipite Spiritum sanctum*, ut eum etiam de se procedere ostenderet. Et ipse est *virtus*, quae *de illo exibat*, ut legitur in Evangelio, *et sanabat omnes* ». Et ut ostenderet, hanc processionem Spiritus sancti non esse aliud quam donationem vel dationem ipsius Spiritus sancti, addidit:[7] « Post resurrectionem Dominus Iesus bis dedit Spiritus sanctum: semel in terra propter dilectionem proximi, et iterum de caelo propter dilectionem Dei; quia per ipsum Donum *diffunditur caritas in cordibus nostris*, qua diligimus Deum et proximum ».

giving is not but temporal, it is established, that this procession or mission is also temporal. (St.) Augustine also hints at this temporal procession of the Holy Spirit in the fifteenth book On the Trinity,[5] saying in these words, that the Holy spirit proceeded from Christ, when after the Resurrection He breathed upon the Disciples: « When Christ had risen from the dead and appeared to the Disciples, He breathed upon (them) and said:[6] *Accept the Holy Spirit*, to show that He proceeds also from Himself. And He Himself is *the Virtue*, which *used to go forth from Him*, as is read in the Gospel, *and He used to cure all* ». And to show, that this procession of the Holy Spirit is not other than the donation and/or giving of the Holy Spirit Himself, he added:[7] « After the Resurrection the Lord Jesus twice gave the Holy Spirit: once on Earth for the sake of the love [dilectionem] of neighbor, and again from Heaven for the sake of the love of God; because through the Gift Himself (that) *charity is poured out in our hearts*, by which we love God and neighbor ».

Cap. II.

Quod non solum dona Spiritus sancti, se etiam ipse Spiritus sanctus datur hominibus et mittitur.

Sunt autem aliqui,[8] qui dicunt, Spiritum sanctum ipsum Deum non dari, sed dona eius, quae non sunt ipse Spiritus. Et ut aiunt, Spiritus sanctus dicitur dari, cum eius gratia, quae tamen non est ipse,[9] datur hominibus. Et hoc dicunt, Bedam sensisse in superioribus verbis, quibus dicit, Spiritum sanctum procedere, cum ipsius gratia datur hominibus, tanquam non ipsemet detur, sed gratia eius. Sed quod ipse Spiritus sanctus, qui Deus est et tertia in Trinitate persona, detur, aperte ostendit Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate[10] ita dicens: « Eundem Spiritum sanctum datum, cum insufflasset Iesus, de quo mox ait: *Ite, baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti*, ambigere non debemus. Ipse est igitur, qui etiam de caelo datus est die Pentecostes.[11] Quomodo ergo Deus non est qui dat Spiritum sanctum? immo quantus est Deus qui dat Deum »? Ecce his verbis aperte dicit, Spiritum sanctum, ipsum scilicet Deum, dari hominibus a Patre et[12] Filio. Et quod ipse Spiritus sanctus, qui Deus est ac tertia in

Chapter II

That not only the gifts of the Holy Spirit, but also the Holy Spirit Himself is given and sent to men.

Moreover, there are some,[8] who say, that the Holy Spirit, God Himself, is not given, but His gifts, which are not the Spirit Himself. And as they say, the Holy Spirit is said to be given, when His grace, which, however, is not Himself,[9] is given to men. And this they say Bede thought in the words above, with which he says, that the Holy Spirit proceeds, when His grace is given to men, not as if His very Self is given, but His grace. But that the Holy Spirit Himself, who is God and the Third Person in the Trinity, is given, (St.) Augustine openly shows in the fifteenth book On the Trinity,[10] saying thus: « That the same Holy Spirit (has been) given, when Jesus breathed upon (them), concerning whom He then said: *Go, baptize all the nations in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit*, we ought not doubt. He Himself is, therefore, the One who has been given from Heaven on Pentecost Day.[11] In what manner, therefore, is God not the one who gives the Holy Spirit? nay how much is God the one who gives God »? Behold with these words

Trinitate persona, nobis detur nostrisque infundatur atque illabatur mentibus, aperte ostendit Ambrosius in primo libro de Spiritu sancto[13] dicens: « Licet multi dicantur spiritus, quia legitur: *Qui facit angelos suos spiritus*, unus tamen est Dei Spiritus. Ipsum igitur unum Spiritum et Apostoli et Prophetae sunt consecuti; sicut etiam vas electionis dicit,[14] quia *unum Spiritum potavimus*, quasi eum, qui non queat scindi, sed infundatur animis et sensibus illabatur, ut saecularis sitis restringat ardorem; qui Spiritus sanctus non est de substantia[15] corporalium nec de substantia invisibilium creaturarum ». His verbis aperte dicit, Spiritum sanctum ipsum, qui creatura non est, infundi mentibus nostris. Item in eodem:[16] « Omnis mutabilis est creatura, sed non mutabilis Spiritus sanctus ». « Quid . . .

he openly says, that the Holy Spirit, that is God Himself, is given to men by the Father and[12] the Son. And that the Holy Spirit Himself, who is God and the Third Person in the Trinity, is given to us and poured fourth and glides into our minds, (St.) Ambrose openly shows in the first book <u>On the Holy Spirit</u>,[13] saying: « Though many are said (to be) spirits, because there is written: *Who makes spirits His Angels*, one, however, is the Spirit of God. Therefore the One Spirit Himself have both the Apostles and Prophets sought out; just as also the Vessel of Election says,[14] that *we have drunk of one Spirit*, as the One, who is not able to be torn, but is poured forth into souls and glides into the senses, to restrain the ardor of thirst for this age [saecularis sitis]; which Holy Spirit is not from [de] the substance of corporals[15] nor of the substance of invisible creatures ». With these words he openly says, that the Holy Spirit Himself, who is not a creature, is poured forth in our minds. Likewise in the same (work he says):[16] « Every creature is mutable, but the Holy Spirit (is) not mutable ». « Why, . . .

---

[1] Ed. 2 *notandum*.
[2] Cap. 27. n. 48. — Paulo ante cod. D post *Filio . . . ad creaturam* addit *sanctificandam*.
[3] Libr. II. homil. 10.
[4] Edd. 1, 8 *sive* et mox post *constat* ed. 2 *quod* loco *quia*.
[5] Cap. 26. n. 45. — Vat. et edd. 4, 6 post *dicens* habent: *Spiritus sanctus processit* pro *Spiritum sanctum processisse*.
[6] Ioan. 20, 22. — Textus sequens sacrae Scripturae est Luc. 6, 19.
[7] Loc. cit. n. 46; sed non paucis transpositis vel omissis. — Edd. 1, 3, 7 8 *addit* pro *addidit*; et immediate nate codd. omittunt *sancti*. Quae omissio, quia saepe in nostris mss. occurrit, deinceps non notatur.
[8] Codd. A C D E *alii*; cod. B nec unum nec alterum vocabulum ponit. Mox codd. A D omittunt *sanctum ipsum Deum*.
[9] Solummodo Vat. et ed. 4 addunt *qui* et sic constructionem mutant. Deinde codd. A D et ed. 8 *homini* pro *hominibus*. — In sequenti propositione Vat. et edd. 4, 6, 9 *ipse* pro *ipsemet*.
[10] Cap. 26. n. 46. — Immediate ante, contra codd. et edd. 1, 8, Vat. cum aliis edd. *dicit* pro *ostendit*. — Textus Scripturae est Matth. 28, 19. Vulgata: *Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes, baptizantes* etc.
[11] Act. 2.
[12] Vat. cum nonnullis edd. et codd. C D repetit *a*.
[13] Cap. 4. n. 60-62. — Locus proximus Scripturae est Psalm. 103, 4.
[14] I. Cor. 12, 13. *Et omnes in uno Spiritu potati*

---

[1] Edition 2 has *must be diligently noted* [diligenter notandum].
[2] Chapter 27, n. 48. — A little before this codex D has *to sanctify a creature* [ad creaturam sanctificandam] for *to a creature* [ad creaturam].
[3] Book II, Homily 10.
[4] Editions 1 and 8 have *or* [sive] and then after *it is established* [constat], edition 2 has *that* [quod] in place of *that* [quia].
[5] Chapter 26, n. 48. — The Vatican edition and editions 4 and 6, after *saying in these words* [his verbis dicens], have *the Holy Spirit proceeded* [Spiritus sanctus processit] for *that the Holy Spirit proceeded* [Spiritum sanctum processisse].
[6] John 20:22. — The following text of Sacred Scripture is Luke 6:19.
[7] <u>Loc</u>. <u>cit</u>., n. 46; but with not a few (words) transposed and/or omitted.
[8] Codices A C D and E have *others* [alii]; codex B omits both *some* and *others*. Then codices A and D omit *Holy . . . God Himself* [sanctum ipsum Deum].
[9] Only the Vatican edition and edition 4 adds *who* [qui] and thus changes the construction. Then codices A D and edition 8 have *to a man* [homini] for *to men* [hominibus]. — In the following proposition the Vatican edition and editions 4, 6 and 9, have *Himself* [ipse] for *His very Self* [ipsemet].
[10] Chapter 26, n. 26. — Immediately before this, contrary to the codices and to editions 1 and 8, the Vatican edition, together with the other editions, has *says* [dicit] for *shows* [ostendit]. — The text of Scripture is Mt. 28:19. The Vulgate reads: *Going,*

sumus. — Paulo post pro *restringat* in originali legitur *restinguat* contra nostros mss. et edd.
[15] Vat. et aliae edd. contra codd. et originale addunt *rerum*; edd. 1, 8 pro *substantia* habent *natura*.
[16] Ibid. n. 64; secundus locus Ambrosii est ibid. n. 66; tertius n. 72; quartus c. 7. n. 82. et 81.

therefore, teach all the nations, baptizing etc. [Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes, baptizantes etc.].
[11] Acts, chapter 2.
[12] The Vatican edition, together with not a few editions and codices C and D, repeats *by* [a].
[13] Chapter 4, nn. 60-62. — The next passage of Scripture is Psalm 103:4.
[14] 1 Cor. 12:13: *And all of us have drunk in the one Spirit* [Et omnes in uno Spiritu potati sumus]. — A little after this in place of *restrain* [restringat] there is read in the original *slake* [restinguat] contrary to our manuscripts and the editions.
[15] The Vatican edition and the other editions, contrary to the codices and the original, add *things* [rerum]; editions 1 and 8 have *nature* [natura] in place of *substance* [substantia].
[16] Ibid., n. 64; the second passage from (St.) Ambrose is ibid., n. 66; the third, n. 72, the fourth, ch. 7, nn. 82 and 81.

---

p. 243

autem dubitem dicere, quia datus est et Spiritus sanctus, cum scriptum sit:[1] *Caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum sanctum, qui datus est nobis* ? « Qui cum sit inaccessibilis natura, receptibilis tamen propter bonitatem suam nobis est, complens virtute omnia, sed qui solis participetur iustis, simplex substantia, opulens virtutibus, unicuique praesens *dividens* de suo *singulis*[2] et ubique totus ». « Incircumscriptus igitur et infinitus[3] Spiritus sanctus, qui discipulorum sensus separatorum infundit, quem nihil potest fallere. Angeli ad paucos mittebantur, Spiritus autem sanctus populis infudebatur. Quis ergo dubitet, quin divinum sit quod infunditur simul pluribus nec videtur? Unus est Spiritus sanctus, qui datus est omnibus licet separatis Apostolis ». Et hic aperte dicit Ambrosius, quod Spiritus sanctus, qui est substantia simplex, cum sit unus, datur pluribus. Alia quoque auctoritate hoc idem astruitur, scilicet quod Spiritus sanctus, qui est aequalis Filio, hominibus detur. Ait enim Augustinus[4] de verbis Apostoli: « Si *caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum sanctum, qui datus est nobis*: a quo datur? Ab illo, qui *dedit dona hominibus*. Quae dona? Spiritum sanctum, qui tale dat donum, qualis est ipse. Magna est misericordia eius: donum dat aequale sibi, quia donum eius Spiritus sanctus est ». Praemissis[5] et aliis pluribus auctoritatibus aperte monastratur, quod Spiritus sanctus

moreover, do I doubt to say, that the Holy Spirit is also given, since there is written:[1] *The charity of God has been poured forth in our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us* ? « Who, though He be inaccessible by nature, is yet receivable by us on account of His own Goodness, completing every virtue, but who is shared by the just alone, simple in Substance, opulent in virtues, present to each one, *dividing* His own [de suo] *to each*[2] and Whole everywhere ». « Therefore, uncircumscribed and infinite (is) [3] the Holy Spirit, who infuses the senses of the separate Disciples, Whom nothing can deceive. Angels used to be sent to a few, but the Holy Spirit used to infuse peoples. Who, therefore, doubts, that it is a divine (work), that He is infused in many at once and (yet) is not seen (by any)? One is the Holy Spirit, who has been given to all the Apostles, though separate ». And here (St.) Ambrose openly says, that the Holy Spirit, who is simple in Substance, since He is one, is given to many. By another authority this same is built up, namely, that the Holy Spirit, who is equal to the son, is given to men. For (St.) Augustine[4] says of the words of the Apostle: « If *the charity of God has been poured forth in our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us*: by whom is He given? By Him, who *gives gifts to men*. What gifts? The Holy Spirit, who gives such a gift, as He Himself is. Great is

aequalis Patri et Filio nobis datur; nec ideo tamen minor est Patre et Filio. Unde Augustinus in quarto libro de Trinitate: « Non ideo,[6] inquit, minorem Spiritum sanctum, quia et eum Pater missit et Filius, arbitrandum est ».

His Mercy: He gives a gift equal to Himself, because the Holy Spirit is His own gift ». With the[5] aforementioned authorities and very many others there is openly shown, that the Holy Spirit, equal to the Father and the Son, is given to us; and for that reason He is not less than the Father or the Son. Whence (St.) Augustine in the fourth book On the Trinity (says): « Not for that reason »,[6] he says, « is one to judge that the Holy Spirit (is) lesser, because both the Father and the Son have sent Him ».

Cap. III.

An viri sancti possint dare Spiritum sanctum.

Hic quaeritur, utrum et viri sancti dent vel dare possint aliis Spiritum sanctum. Quem si aliis dant, cum eius donatio supra sit dicta processio, videtur ab eis procedere Spiritus sanctus vel mitti; sed Creator a creatura non procedit vel mittitur. Restat ergo, ut ipsi non dent Spiritum sanctum nec dare possit. Unde Augustinus in decimo quinto libro de Trinitate:[7] « Non aliquis discipulorum Christi dedit Spiritum sanctum. *Orabant* quippe, *ut veniret in eos*, quibus manum imponebant, non ipse eum dabant. Quem morem in suis praepositis etiam nunc servat Ecclesia. Denique et Simon magus, offerens Apostolis pecuniam, non ait: *Date et mihi hanc potestatem, ut* dem Spiritum sanctum; sed, *cuicumque*, inquit, *imposuero manus, accipiat Spiritum sanctum*; quia nec Scriptura superius dixerat: videns autem Simon, quia Apostoli darent Spiritum sanctum, sed dixerat: *videns autem Simon, quia per impositionem manuum Apostolorum daretur Spiritus sanctus* ». Ecce his verbis ostendit Augustinus, nec Apostolos nec alios Ecclesiae praelatos dedisse vel dare Spiritum sanctum.

Chapter III

Whether or not holy men could give the Holy Spirit.

Here there is asked, whether holy men also give and/or could give to others the Holy Spirit. Whom if they do give to others, since His being given [donatio] has been said above (to be His) procession, it seems that the Holy Spirit proceeds and/or is sent from them; but the Creator does not proceed from the creature nor is He sent. Therefore it remains, that these do not give the Holy spirit nor could they give (Him). Whence (St.) Augustine in the fifteenth book On the Trinity (says):[7] « None of the disciples of Christ gave the Holy Spirit. *The used to pray* indeed, *that He might come upon them*, on whom they used to impose a hand, they themselves did not use to give Him. Which custom the Church now also observes among Her own overseers [praepositis]. Next, even Simon Magus, offering money to the Apostles, did not say: *Give to me also this power, that* I may given the Holy Spirit; but, (so that) *to whomsoever*, he say, *I shall impose hands, he may receive the Holy Spirit*; because neither did Scripture say above: 'but Simon seeing, that the Apostles gave the Holy Spirit', but (rather) it said: *but Simon seeing, that through the imposition of the hands of the Apostles the Holy Spirit was given* ». Behold with these words (St.) Augustine shows, that neither the Apostles nor the other prelates of the Church gave and/or give the Holy Spirit.

Et quod plus est, non posse etiam dare, dicit in eodem libro[8] subdens: « De Christo scriptum est, quod *acceperit a Patre promissionem Spiritus sancti et effuderit*; in quo utraque natura monstrata est, humana scilicet et divina. *Accepit* quippe ut homo,

And what is more, he says, that one cannot even give (Him), subjoining in the same book:[8] « Of Christ it is written, that *He accepted from the Father the promises of the Holy Spirit and poured (Him) forth*; in which each nature has been demonstrated,

effudit ut Deus. Nos autem *accipere* quidem hoc Donum possumus pro modulo nostro, *effundere* vero super alios non utique possumus, sed ut hoc fiat, Deum super eos, a quo id efficitur, invocamus ». His verbis expresse dicit,[9] nos Spiritum sanctum non posse super alios effundere, id est aliis dare.

Sed huic videtur contrarium quod Apostolus ad Galatas[10] de se loquens ait: *Qui tribuit vobis Spiritum, et operatur virtutes in vobis*. Ecce evidenter dicit, se tribuisse Spiritum. Sed intelligendum est, Apostolum dixisse hoc, non quia haberet potestatem et auctoritatem dandi Spiritum sanctum, sed quia ministerium habuerit, in quo dabatur a Deo Spiritus sanctus. Ut enim ait Augustinus super eundem locum, exponens illud Apostoli verbum:[11] « Ab Apostolo praedicata est eis fides, in qua praedicatione adventum et praesentiam sancti Spiritus senserant, sicut illo tempore in novitate invitationis ad fidem etiam sensibilibus miraculis praesentia Spiritus sancti apparebat, ut in Actibus Apostolorum legitur ». Aperte hic ostendit, quomodo illis Spiritum sanctum Apostolus tribuerit, non utique ipsum mittendo in eos, sed praedicando eis fidem Christi, quam illis recipientibus, quod Spiritus sanctus in eis esset, aliquibus signis visibilibus monstrabatur. Non ergo homines quantumcumque sancti dare possunt Spiritum sanctum.

that is, the human and the divine. *He accepted*, indeed, as a man, *He poured forth* as God. Moreover, we can indeed *accept* this Gift in our own little measure [pro modulo nostro], but *to pour (Him) forth* upon others we cannot do at all, but we invoke God upon us, so that this may come to pass, by Him whom it is effected ». With these words he[9] expressly says, that we cannot pour forth the Holy Spirit upon others, that is, give (Him) to others.

But to this seems contrary what the Apostle, speaking of himself, says <u>To the Galatians</u>:[10] w*ho granted you the Spirit, and who works virtues among you.* Behold evidently he says, that he granted the Spirit. But it must be understood, that the Apostle spoke this, not because he had the power and authority to give the Holy Spirit, but because he had the ministry, in which the Holy Spirit is given by God. For as (St.) Augustine says on the same passage, expounding that word of the Apostle:[11] « From the Apostle the Faith has been preached to them, in which preaching they had sensed the advent and presence of the Holy Spirit, just as at that time in the newness of the invitation to the Faith the presence of the Holy Spirit appeared even by sensible miracles, as is read in <u>The Acts of the Apostles</u> ». Here he openly shows, in what manner the Apostle granted the Holy Spirit to them, not indeed by sending Him upon them, but by preaching the Faith of Christ to them, which (faith), by some visible signs, showed those receiving (it), that the Holy Spirit was in them. Therefore men, cannot give the Holy Spirit, howsoever holy (they may be).

---

[1] Rom. 5, 5. — Paulo ante Vat. et edd. 8, 9 omittunt *et* ante *Spiritus*.
[2] Respicitur illud I. Cor. 12, 11. — In principio huius loci Ambrosiani codd. et ed. 6 legunt *receptabilis* pro *receptibilis*. Paulo post Vat. sola *complectens* pro *complens*. Deinde ed. 8 pro *opulens* habet *opulentus*.
[3] Vat. et edd. 1, 4, 5, 6, 9 addunt *est*. — Circa finem huius loci cod. D *dividitur* pro *videtur*, quae lectio, licet in se bona sit, tamen est contra litteram et contextum Ambrosii et contra edd. et alios codd. — Immediate post cod. D, Vat. et edd. 3, 4, 5, 6, 9 verbis *unus est* addunt *ergo*.
[4] Serm. 128. n. 4 (olim 43.); sed Magister varia transponit et omittit. — Vat. et edd. 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 male et contra codd. in textu pro *verbis Apostoli* posuerunt *verbis Domini*, cum Magister hic non citet

[1] Rm 5:5. — A little before this the Vatican edition, and editions 8 and 9, omit *also* [et] at *Holy Spirit* [Spiritus sanctus].
[2] A reference to 1 Cor. 12:11. — At the beginning of this passage from (St.) Ambrose, the codices and edition 6 have *receptabilis* for *receptibilis* [receiveable]. A little after this the Vatican edition alone has *embracing* [complectens] for *completing* [complens]. Then edition 8 has *opulent* [opulentus] for *opulent* [opulens].
[3] The Vatican edition and editions 1, 4, 5, 6, and 9 add *is* [est]. — Near the end of this passage, codex D has *and is not divided* [nec dividitur] for *and (yet) is not seen (by any)* [nec videtur]; which reading, though it is good in itself, is however contrary to the text and the context of (St.) Ambrose and contrary to the editions and to the other codices. —

librum Augustini, sed verba Apostoli indicet; insuper contra edd. 1, 8 Vat. aliaeque edd. pro *si* legunt *sic*. Verba Scripturae sunt Rom. 5, 5, et Eph. 4, 8: *dedit dona hominibus*.

[5] Vat. et edd. 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 addunt *his*.

[6] Cap. 21. n. 32. — Mox Vat. et edd. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 superflue adiiciunt *ait* post *Trinitate*. Deinde post *minorem* solummodo edd. 1, 8 addunt *esse*.

[7] Cap. 26. n. 46. — Ab Augustino respicitur ad Act. 8, 15-19.

[8] Ibid. parum infra. Citatur ab Augustino Act. 2, 33.

[9] Cod. D addit *Augustinus*.

[10] Cap. 3, 3.

[11] Exposit. Epist. ad Gal. n. 20. — Sola Vat. hic addit reliqua verba Apostoli ex eodem versu 5: *Ex operibus legis Spiritum accepistis, an ex auditu fidei* ? ad quae verba Augustini immediate sequentia referuntur. — De visibili missione Spiritus sancti legitur Act. 2.

Immediately after this, codex D, the Vatican edition and editions 3, 4, 5, 6, and 9, add to the words *One is* [unus est], *therefore* [ergo].

[4] Sermon 128, n. 4 (previously 43); but Master (Peter) transposes and omits various words. — The Vatican edition and editins 1, 5, 6, 8, and 9, badly and contrary to the codices, puts in the text in place of the words *the words of the Apostle* [verbis Apostoli] the words *the words of the Lord* [verbis Domini], though Master (Peter) does not here cite the book of (St.) Augustine, but indicates the words of the Apostle; moreover contrary to editions 1 and 8, the Vatican edition and the other editions have *Thus* [sic] for *If* [si]. The words of Scripture are Rm 5:5 and Eph. 4:8 : *He gave gifts to men* [dedit dona hominibus].

[5] The Vatican edition and editions 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9, add *these* [his].

[6] Chapter 21, n. 32. — Then the Vatican edition and editions 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9 superfluously insert *said* [ait] after *Trinity* [Trinitate]. Next, at *lesser* [minorem] only editions 1 and 8 add *is* [esse].

[7] Chapter 26, n. 46. — The reference by (St.) Augustine is to Acts 8:15-19.

[8] Ibid., a little below the former. The citation by (St.) Augustine is Acts 2:33.

[9] Codex D adds *(St.) Augustine* [Augustinus].

[10] Gal. 3:3.

[11] Exposition on the Epistle to the Galatians, n. 20. The Vatican edition alone adds here the remaining words ofthe Apostle, fromthe same verse 5: *Out of the works of the Law have you accepted the Spirit, or out of the hearing of the Faith ?* [Ex operibus legis Spiritum accepistis, an ex auditu fidei ?] to which words of (St.) Augustine the things, which follow immediately, refer. — On the visible mission of the Holy Spirit see Acts, chapter 2.

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation that that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIV.

De temporali processione Spiritus sancti quantum ad principium a quo.

ARTICULUS I.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 244-247.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Praeterea diligenter notandum est, quod gemina est Spiritus sancti processio.

DIVISIO TEXTUS.

Terminata parte, quae est de processione aeterna, hic incipit secunda pars, quae est de processione temporali. Et quoniam in hac processione est tria considerare, scilicet *principium a quo* procedit Spiritus sanctus, et *modus secundum quem*, et *proprietas per*[1] *quam* aptus natus est procedere: ideo haec pars habet tres partes, in quarum *prima* agit Magister de processione temporali per comparationem *ad principium a quo*; in *secunda* agit de ipsa in comparatione ad *modum secundum quem*, infra, distinctione decima quinta circa medium, ibi: *Hic quaeritur, utrum semel tantum missus sit*;[2] in *tertia* per comparationem ad *proprietatem per quam* natus est temporaliter procedere, et hoc est donum sive donabilitas, infra, distinctione decima octava in principio: *Hic quaeritur, cum Spiritus sanctus, per quem dividuntur dona*.

Prima pars iterum haet duas: in *prima* parte ostendit,[3] quod Spiritus sanctus temporaliter mittatur sive procedat a Patre et Filio; *secundo* quaeritur, utrum mittatur sive procedat a se, infra, distinctione decima quinta in principio: *Hic considerandum est, cum Spiritus sanctus detur hominibus a Patre et Filio*.

Prima pars est praesentis distinctionis et

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIV

On the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit as much as regards the principle from which.

ARTICLE I

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 244-247.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Moreover, it must be diligently noted, that there is a twin procession of the Holy Spirit.

DIVISION OF THE TEXT.

With the part terminated, which concerns the eternal procession, here the second part begins, which concerns the temporal procession. And since in this procession it is that one considers three (things), namely, the *principle from which* the Holy Spirit proceeds, and the *manner according to which*, and the *property through*[1] *which* as One apt He is bound [natus est] to proceed: for that reason this part has three parts, in *the first* of which Master (Peter) deals with the temporal procession through a comparison *to the principle from which*; in *the second* he deals with it in comparison to *the manner according to which*, below, in the fifteenth distinction, near the middle, there (where he says): *Here there is asked, whether the Son has only been sent once*;[2] in *the third* through a comparison to *the property through which* He is bound [natus est] to proceed temporally, and this is "Gift" or "donability", below, in the eighteenth distinction, at the beginning: *Here there is asked, why the Holy Spirit, through whom gifts are divided*.

The first part again has two (parts): in the *first* part he shows, [3] that the Holy Spirit is sent or proceeds temporally from the Father and the son; *second* there is asked, whether He is sent or proceeds from Himself, below, in the fifteenth distinction, at the beginning: *Here there must be considered, since the Holy Spirit is given to men by the Father and the Son*.

The first part belongs to the present

habet duas partes: in prima ostendit, quod procedit temporaliter a Patre et Filio; in secunda quaerit,[4] utrum Spiritus sanctus detur a sanctis hominibus, ibi: *Hic quaeritur, utrum et sancti viri dent vel possint dare* etc.

distinction and has two parts: in the first he shows, that He proceeds temporally from the Father and the Son; in the second he asks,[4] whether the Holy Spirit is given by holy men, there: *Here there is asked, whether holy men also give and/or could give* etc..

In *prima* iterum parte tria facit secundum tria capitula.[5] In prima ostendit, quod gemina est processio Spiritus sancti; in secunda, quod utraque processio est a Patre et Filio, ibi: *De temporali autem processione Beda in homilia* etc.; in tertia, quia Spiritus sancti temporalis processio eius est donatio, ostendit, quod ipse Spiritus sanctus in propria persona donetur, non tantum in effectu, ibi: *Sunt autem aliqui, qui dicunt, Spiritum sanctum*.

In *the first* part he again makes three (divisions) according to the three chapters.[5] In the first he shows, that there is a twin procession of the Holy Spirit; in the second, that each procession is from the Father and the Son, there (where he says): *Moreover, of the temporal procession (St.) Bede (the Venerable) speaks thus in (his) Homily* etc.; in the third, because the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit is a being-bestowed [donatio], he shows, that the Holy Spirit Himself is bestowed in His own Person, not only in effect, there (where he says): *Moreover, there are some, who say, that the Holy Spirit*.

Hic quaeritur, utrum et sancti viri dent vel possint dare. Haec est *secunda* pars praesentis distinctionis,[6] in qua, ostenso quod Spiritus sanctus procedat temporaliter sive donetur a Patre et Filio, quaerit Magister, utrum detur ab aliquo sancto viro. Et haec pars habet tres partes secundum tria quae ostendit. Primo namque declarat et probat, quod Spiritus sanctus non *detur* ab aliquo sancto viro. Secundo vero ostendit auctoritate Augustini, quod non *potest dari*, ibi: *Et quod plus est, non posse etiam dare dicit* etc. In tertia opponit ad contrarium, quia videtur datus a Paulo, ibi: *Sed huic videtur contrarium quod Apostolus* etc., ubi solvit, quod non est datus ab ipso, sed ab eius ministerio.[7]

Here there is asked, whether holy men also given and/or could give. This is the *second* part of the present distinction,[6] in which, having shown that the Holy Spirit proceeds temporally or is bestowed by the Father and the Son, Master (Peter) asks, whether He is given by any holy man. And this part has three parts according to the three (divisions) which he shows. For first he declares and proves, that he Holy Spirit *is* not *given* by any holy man. But second he shows by the authority of (St.) Augustine, that *He can* not *be given*, there (where he says): *And what is more, he says that one cannot even give (Him)* etc.. In the third he opposes to the Contrary, that He seems (to have been) given by (St.) Paul, there (where he says): *But to this seems contrary what the Apostle* etc., where he resolves, that He has not been given by him, but by his ministry.[7]

TRACTATIO QUAESTIONUM.

Ad intelligentiam eorum, quae dicuntur in praesenti distinctione, duo principaliter quaeruntur.

Primo quaeritur de processione temporali Spiritus sancti.

Secundo de eius donatione.

Quantum ad primum quaeruntur duo.

Primo quaeritur,[8] utrum sit ponere processionem temporalem Spiritus

TREATMENT OF THE QUESTIONS

For an understanding of those (things), which are said in the present distinction, two (things) are principally asked.

First one asks of the temporal procession of the Holy Spirit.

Second of His donation.

As much as regards the first two (things) are asked.

First there is asked,[8] whether it is, that one posits a temporal procession

sancti.
Secundo, utrum processio temporalis ponat in numerum cum aeterna.

of the Holy Spirit.
Second, whether the temporal procession counts [ponat] in number with the eternal.

[1] Aliqui codd. ut W X Z *secundum*.
[2] Vat., mss. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, ponit falso principium d. 16. scil. *Nunc de Spiritu sancto videndum est* etc.
[3] Ed. 1 *ostenditur*.
[4] Vat. *quaeritur*, sed contra mss. et ed. 1.
[5] Ex mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *tria capitula* loco *tres partes*.
[6] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 praecedentem propositionem ita exhibet: *Similiter secunda pars, quae incipit ibi: Hic quaeritur utrum et sancti viri dent* etc.
[7] Cod. K *per eius ministerium*; cod. Y *in* loco *ab*.
[8] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *Primo quaeritur*; aliqui codd. tamen omittunt *quaeritur*.

[1] Some codices, such as W X and Z, have *according to* [secundum] instead of *through* [per].
[2] The Vatican edition, with the manuscripts and edition 1 striving against it, falsely exhibts the beginning of distinction 16 thus: *Now of the Holy Spirit it must be seen* etc. [Nunc de Spiritu sancto videndum est].
[3] Edition 1 has *is shown* [ostenditur].
[4] The Vatican edition has *there is asked* [quaeritur], but contray to the manuscripts and edition 1.
[5] From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *three chapters* [tria capitula] in place of *three parts* [tres partes].
[6] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, thus exhibits the preceding proposition: *Similarly the second part, which begins there: Here there is asked, whether holy men also give* etc. [Similiter secunda pars, quae incipit ibi: Hic quaeritur utrum et sancti viri dent].
[7] Codex K has *through his ministry* [per eius ministerium]; codex Y has *in* [in] in place of *by* [ab].
[8] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have supplied *First there is asked* [Primo quaeritur]; some codices however omit the *there is asked* [quaeritur].

p. 245

ARTICULUS I.

De processione temporali Spiritus sancti.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum processio temporalis Spiritus sancti pondenda sit.

Quod sit ponenda processio temporalis, videtur:
1. Per Bedam, qui dicit in homilia, et habetur in littera:[1] « Spiritus sancti missio est eius processio »; sed missio est temporalis: ergo est ponere processionem Spiritus sancti temporalem.

2. Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur *ratione* sic: procedere est ab uno in alium; cum ergo Spiritus sanctus sit a Deo et sit in creatura et in creatura sit a Deo,[2] a Deo procedit in creaturam; hoc autem non est, antequam creatura sit, sed hoc est ex tempore: ergo etc.

ARTICLE I

On the temporal procession of the Holy Sprit.

QUESTION 1

Whether a temporal procession of the Holy Spirit is to be posited.

That there is to be posited a temporal procession, seems (from the following):
1. Through (St.) Bede (the Venerable), who says in (his) Homily, and (as) there is had in the text:[1] « The being-sent [missio] of the Holy Spirit is His procession »; but His mission is temporal: therefore it is, that one posits a temporal procession of the Holy Spirit.

2. Likewise, this very (thing) is shown *by reason* in this manner: "to proceed" is a 'from one into another'; therefore since the Holy Spirit is from God and is in a creature, and in the creature He is from God,[2] He proceeds from God into the creature; but this is not, before the creature is, but this is

in time [ex tempore]: ergo etc..

3. Item, donum sive datum a dante procedit in accipientem, cum datur; sed Spiritus sanctus ex tempore datur: ergo ex tempore procedit a dante in recipientem:[3] ergo est ponere processionem temporalem.

3. Likewise, a gift or (something) given by one giving (it) proceeds into the one accepting (it), when it is given; but the Holy Spirit is given in time: therefore in time He proceeds from the One giving into the one receiving:[3] therefore it is, that one posits a temporal procession.

Contra: 1. Spiritus sancti processio idem est quod eius spiratio; sed non dicitur eius spiratio aliqua temporalis: ergo nec processio.

On the contrary: 1. The procession of the Holy Spirit is the same (thing) which His spiration (is); but His spiration is not said (to be) anything temporal: therefore neither the procession.

2. Item, sicut processio se habet ad Spiritum sanctum, sic generatio ad Filium, et quemadmodum Spiritus sanctus mittitur in mentem, ita[4] Filius, et utrumque ex tempore; sed generatio Filii ratione talis missionis nullo modo dicitur temporalis: ergo nec processio Spiritus sancti.

2. Likewise, just as the procession holds itself to the Holy Spirit, in the same manner the generation to the Son, and according to the manner in which the Holy Spirit is sent into the mind, so[4] the Son, and Each in time; but the generation of the Son by reason of such a mission is in no manner said (to be) temporal: therefore neither the procession of the Holy Spirit.

3. Item, processio Spiritus sancti non dicitur temporalis, nisi secundum quod est processio ab aliquo in aliquid, utpote in creaturam; sed processio ab aliquo in aliquid non est nisi dupliciter: aut secundum processum ab agente in suscipiens, aut secundum processum a loco in locum. Sed primo modo *non* est temporalis processio, quia Spiritus sanctus est persona in se fixa et stans: ergo non producitur in suscipiente.[5] Secundo modo *non*, quia quod tali modo procedit, a principio recedit et ad terminum accedit; hoc autem non convenit Spiritui sancto.

3. Likewise, the procession of the Holy Spirit is not said (to be) temporal, except according to which it is a procession from something into something, as for example [utpote] into a creature; but a procession from something into something is not but in a twofold manner: either according to a processing from something acting into something taking-it-up [ab agente in suscipiens], or according to a processing from place into place. But in the first manner the procession *is not* temporal, because the Holy Spirit is a Person in Himself, fixed and standing still [stans]: therefore He is not produced in the one taking-Him-up.[5] In the second manner (it is) not (also), because whatever proceeds in such a manner, recedes from (its) principle and accedes to the terminus; but this is not befitting to the Holy Spirit.

4. Item, omne quod temporaliter procedit ab alio, habet initium essendi ex tempore; si ergo Spiritus sanctus temporaliter procedit, ergo eius[6] *esse* incipit.

4. Likewise, everything which proceeds temporally from another, has a starting-point for its being in time [initium essendi ex tempore]; if, therefore, the Holy Spirit proceed temporally, therefore His[6] '*being*' began.

5. Item, processio temporalis aut dicitur temporalis ratione *Spiritus sancti* aut[7] *gratiae*: non ratione *Spiritus sancti*, quia persona aeterna est; similiter videtur, quod nec ratione *gratiae*, quia Augustinus dicit

5. Likewise, the temporal procession is either said (to be) temporal by reason *of the Holy Spirit* or[7] *of a grace*: not by reason *of the Holy Spirit*, because the Person is eternal; similarly it seems, that neither by

quarto de Trinitate:[8] « Secundum quod aliquid aeternum mente capimus, non sumus in hoc mundo »: ergo si gratia elevat ad capiendum aeternum *esse* eius, et processio non est temporalis, ergo nec processio Spiritus sancti ratione *gratiae*.

reason *of a grace*, because (St.) Augustine says in the fourth (book) On the Trinity:[8] « According to which we grasp anything eternal with (our) mind, we are not in this world »: therefore if grace elevates one to grasp His eternal '*being*', and the procession is not temporal, therefore neither (is) the procession of the Holy Spirit (temporal) by reason *of a grace*.

6. Item, in processione Spiritus sancti in creaturam est processio Doni increati, quod est Spiritus sanctus et doni creati, quod est gratia; sed Donum increatum est nobilius; ergo cum *a nobiliori* debeat fieri *denominatio*,[9] processio Spiritus sancti in creaturam debet dici processio increata, sed omnis talis est aeterna, non temporalis: ergo etc.

6. Likewise, in the procession of the Holy Spirit into a creature there is a procession of the uncreated Gift, which the Holy Spirit is, and of the created gift, which is a grace; but the uncreated Gift is more noble; therefore since a *denomination* ought to come to be *from the more noble*,[9] the procession of the Holy Spirit into a creature ought to be said (to be) an uncreated procession, but every such is eternal, not temporal: ergo etc..

CONCLUSIO.

Ponenda est processio Spiritus sancti temporalis non ratione eius, a quo procedit, sed ratione eius, in quod procedit sicut in susceptivum, in quo recipitur.

CONCLUSION

There is to be posited a temporal procession of the Holy Spirit not by reason of That, from whom He proceeds, but by reason of that, into which He proceeds as into (something) susceptive, in which He is received.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod processio, secundum quod *communiter* accipitur de Filio et de Spiritu sancto, dicitur emanatio ab hoc, scilicet a Patre, secundum quod dicitur de *Spiritu sancto*, dicitur processio ab uno in alium. Sed procedere ab uno in alium est dupliciter: aut sicut in *obiectum*, in quod *protenditur*, aut sicut in *susceptivum*, in quo *recipitur*. Et *primus* quidem modus est in processione aeterna; quia enim Spiritus sanctus procedit ut amor mutuus, ideo procedit a duobus, ita quod ab uno in alium. « Spiritus enim sanctus, ut dicit Hieronymus[10] et Augustinus, amor est, quo Pater amat Filium et Filius amat Patrem ». *Secundus* mo- / -dus . . .

I respond: It must be said, that "procession", according to which it is *commonly* accepted of the Son and of the Holy Sprit, is said (to be) an emanation from Him, that is from the Father, (and) according to which it is said of *the Holy Spirit*, it is said (to be) a procession from One into the Other. But "proceeding from one into another" is in a two fold manner: either just as into *the object*, into which it is extended forward [protenditur], or just as into *(something) susceptive*, in which *it is received*. And *the first* manner is indeed in the eternal procession; for because the Holy Spirit proceeds as mutual Love, for that reason He proceeds from the Two, so that (He proceeds) from One into Another. « For the Holy Sprit », as (St.) Jerome[10] says and (St.) Augustine (too), « is the Love, by which the Father loves the Son and the Son loves the Father ». *The second* man- / -ner . . .

---

[1] Hic, c. 1, in quo textu fide mss. et ed. 1 adiunximus *eius*.

[2] Ita codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. perperam omittit *et in creatura sit a Deo*. Paulo ante cod. K post *alium*

[1] Here, in ch. 1, in which text, trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, we have inserted *His* [eius].

[2] Thus the codices together with edition 1, while the

addit *tendere vel ab uno in alio esse*.
[3] Plures codd. ut F G H cum ed. 1 *accipientem*.
[4] In nonnullis mss. ut K bb ff et ed. 1 adiungitur *et*.
[5] Auctoritate mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 expunximus hic in Vat. additum *sed in se*. Paulo ante cod. W post *processio* legit *respectu Spiritus sancti; est enim persona*; cod. Y autem nomini *persona* praemittit *tali modo*, quod refertur ad *primo modo*.
[6] In Vat. et cod. dd desideratur *eius*, quod tamen in aliis mss. et ed. 1 habetur.
[7] Cod. M hic repetit *ratione*.
[8] Cap. 20. n. 28.
[9] Cfr. supra Prooem. q. 4. arg. 2. ad opp.
[10] Comment. in Psalm. 17. — August., VI de Trin. c. 5. n. 7. Vide supra d. X. lit. Magistri, c. 2. — Verba praecedentia: ab uno in alium procedit, intelligenda sunt secundum ea quae dicta sunt d. 13. a. 1. q. 1. ad 4.

Vatican edition faultily omits *and in the creature He is from God* [et in creatura sit a Deo]. A little before this codex K for phrase *a "from one into another"* [ab uno in alium] has *"to tend from one into another and/or be from one in another"* [ab uno in alium tendere vela b uno in alio esse].
[3] Very many codices, such as F G and H together with edition 1, have *into the one accepting* [in accipientem].
[4] In not a few manuscripts, such as K bb ff and edition 1, there is added *also* [et].
[5] On the authority of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, 3, we have expunged here in the Vatican edition the added *but in Himself* [sed in se]. A little before this codex W adds to the first clause, just before the comma, *in respect to the Holy Spirit; for He is a Person* [respectu Spiritus sancti; est enim persona]; but codex Y, in reference to the first manner, inserts *in such a manner* [tali modo] before *a Person* [persona].
[6] In the Vatican edition and codex dd the *His* [eius] is wanting, which however is had in the other manuscripts and in edition 1.
[7] Codex M here repeats *by reason* [ratione].
[8] Chapter 20, n. 28.
[9] Cf. the Seraphic Doctor's discussion of the Foreword to Book I, q. 4, arg. 2 ad opp.
[10] Commentary on Psalm 17. — (St.) Augustine, On the Trinity, Bk. VI, ch. 5, n. 7. See above the text of Master (Peter), d. 10, ch. 2. — The preceding words: He proceeds "from One into Another" are to be understood according to what is said in d. 13, a. 1, q. 1, in reply to n. 4.

---

p. 246

mod- / -dus in illa[1] esse non potuit, quamvis ita intellexerint Graeci, quod in Filio recipitur Spiritus sanctus et a Patre producitur. Sed penes secundum modum — cum receptio Spiritus sancti sit per influentiam doni[2] gratuiti, quod ex tempore est — attenditur processio *temporalis*, secundum quam Spiritus sanctus dicitur procedere ab aliquo in aliquem non tantum sicut in obiectum, sed sicut in habitaculum. Et sic concedendum est, quod est processio temporalis Spiritus sancti, non ratione eius *a quo*, sed ratione eius *in quod* procedit.

cannot be in that (eternal emanation),[1] though thus did the Greeks understand, that the Holy Spirit is received by the Son and produced from the Father. But in and through [penes] that second manner — since the reception of the Holy Spirit is through the influence of a gratuitous gift,[2] which is in time — a *temporal* procession is attained, according to which the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from Someone into someone, not only as into an object, but as into a tiny dwelling. And in this manner it is to be conceded, that there is a temporal procession of the Holy Spirit, not by reason of That *from which*, but by reason of that *into which* He proceeds.

1. 2. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur de spiratione et generatione, iam patet responsio, quia neutrum horum nominum respectum dicit ad[3] terminum, in quem fit processio.

1. 2. To that, therefore, which is objected concerning spiration and generation, the response is already clear, that neither of those names means a looking-back to[3] the terminus, into which the procession is made.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod processio

3. To that which is objected, that the

Spiritus sancti non potest esse ab aliquo in aliquid[4] ut in susceptivum; dicendum, quod verum est ratione ipsius personae; sed tamen ratione connotati, quod est gratia, in qua datur Spiritus sanctus, suscipitur, quia gratia est in aliquo sicut in susceptivo.

procession of the Holy Spirit cannot be from something into something,[4] as into (something) susceptive; it must be said, that it is true by reason of the Person Himself; but, however, by reason of the (thing) connoted, which is the grace, in which the Holy Spirit is given, He is taken up, because the grace is in someone as in (something) susceptive.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur: quod temporaliter procedit incipit esse; dicendum, quod hoc est dupliciter,[5] quia haec determinatio *temporaliter* potest poni circa actum procedendi per comparationem ad *principium a quo*, vel in comparatione ad *terminum in quem*. *Primo* modo vera est propositio; sed sic non dicitur Spiritus sanctus[6] procedere temporaliter, eo quod ex tempore producatur. *Alio* modo per comparationem ad *terminum in quem*; sic[7] non habet veritatem, si procedit in hoc ex tempore, quod habeat initium, sed solum, quod incipiat esse in hoc.

4. To that which is objected: 'what proceeds temporally begins to be'; it must be said, that this is in a twofold manner,[5] because this determination *temporally* can be posited about an act of proceeding through a comparison to the *principle from which*, and/or in comparison to the *terminus into which*. In *the first* manner the proposition is true; but the Holy[6] Spirit is not said in this manner to proceed temporally, in that He is produced in time. In *another* manner through a comparison to the *terminus into which*; thus[7] (the proposition) does not have truth, if 'He proceeds in this (manner) in time, because He has a starting-point', but only, 'because He begins to be in this (manner)'.

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod gratia non procedit temporaliter, quia elevat ad aeternum; dicendum, quod *temporale* dicitur tripliciter. *Uno* modo dicitur temporale quod habet initium et variationem et actum in tempore; et hoc modo dicitur temporale quod subiacet tempori et est corruptibile et variable. *Secundo* modo dicitur temporale quod habet initium essendi in tempore,[8] sed non variationem, ut anima. *Tertio* modo dicitur temporale quod habet initium in tempore, sed actum extra tempus et supra tempus elevatum; et hoc tertio modo dicitur temporalis processio vel gratie donatio.

5. To that which is objected, that grace does not proceed temporally, because it elevates to eternity; it must be said, that the *temporal* is said in a threefold manner. In *one* manner the temporal is said (to be) that which has a starting-point and variation and an act in time [in tempore]; and in this manner the temporal is said (to be) that which is subjected to time and is corruptible and variable. In the *second* manner the temporal is said (to be) that which has a starting-point of being in time [initium essendi in tempore],[8] but not a variation, such as the soul. In the *third* manner the temporal is said (to be) that which has a starting-point in time, but an act outside of time and elevated above time; and in this third manner there is said (to be) a temporal procession and/or donation of grace.

Potest tamen dici, quod gratia habet esse temporale ratione eius in quo est, scilicet liberi arbitrii,[9] quod mutatur et variatur; et verbum Augustini, quod dicit, quod non sumus in hoc mundo, est intelligendum quantum ad conformitatem.

It can, however, be said, that grace has a temporal "being" by reason of that in which it is, namely, (by reason) of free will [liberii arbitrii],[9] which is changed and is varied; and the word of (St.) Augustine, which says, that we are not in this world, is to be understood as much as regards conformity.

6. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod denominatio

6. To that which is objected, that a

debet esse a digniori; dicendum, quod totum copulatum, quia destruitur destructione cuiuslibet partis, habet denominationem a parte imperfectiori. Unde si una pars copulationis est *falsa*, totum copulatum dicitur esse falsum: si una *contingens*, totum indicatur contingens; si una temporalis, et totum temporale.[10] Quia ergo processio temporalis includit emanationem aeternam personae et emanatinem gratiae, quae temporalis est, ideo dicitur temporalis et non aeterna.

denomination ought to be from the more worthy (part); it must be said, that a whole copulate, because it is destroyed by the destruction of any part, has its denomination from the more imperfect part. Whence if one part of the copulate [copulationis] is *false*, the whole copulate is said to be false: if one *contingent*, the whole is indicated as contingent; if one temporal, the whole (is) temporal.[10] Therefore, because the temporal procession includes the eternal emanation of the Person and the emanation of a grace, which is temporal, for that reason it is said (to be) temporal and not eternal.

Et quod[11] dicitur, quod denominatio debet fieri a digniori: dicendum, quod non est verum nisi in eo, in quo illud quod minus dignum est, conformitatur digniori.

And because[11] it is said, that a denomination ought to come to be from the more worthy (part): it must be said, that it is not true, except in that, in which that which is less worthy, is conformed to the more worthy.

SCHOLION.

I. Posito hoc principio, quod in processione amoris praeter principium *a quo* sit etiam terminus *ad quem*, quia amor tendit in alium, unde est in amante ut in subiecto, in amato vero ut in obiecto seu termino, ipse terminus processionis iterum distinguitur. Aut enim est simpliciter obiectum sive terminus, aut est aliquod susceptivum, i. e. tale subiectum, quod aliquid recipit. Hic secundus modus propter suam imperfectionem non convenit divinis personis in se spectatis, invenitur tamen in missione temporali, quatenus creatura rationalis per gratia fit habitaculum Spiritus sancti. Tunc enim Spiritus sanctus in hac creatura de novo incipit esse vel alio modo esse, quam antea erat; per quod, ut dicit Richard. a Med. (hic q. 1.), « import- / - tatur . . .

SCHOLIUM

I. Having posited this principle, 'that in a procession of love, besides the principle *from which* there is also the terminus *to which*' — because love tends into the other, whence it is in the one loving as in a subject, but in the one loved as in an object or terminus — the very terminus of the procession is distinguished. For either it is simply the object or terminus, or it is something susceptive, i. e. such a subject, that it receives something. This second manner on account of its imperfection does not befit the Divine Persons considered [spectatis] in Themselves, yet it is found in the temporal mission, to the extent that the rational creature through a grace becomes a little dwelling of the Holy Spirit. For then the Holy Spirit begins to be anew in this creature and/or to be in manner other, than that which He was beforehand; through which, as Richard of Middleton (here in q. 1) says, « there is conveyed . . .

---

[1] In ed. 1 explicative additur *aeterna emanatione*, in qua et paulo infra cum aliquibus mss. ut aa bb *recipiatur* pro *recipitur* et *producatur* loco *producitur* habetur. In fine huius propositionis Vat., omisso puncto, prosequitur propositionem.
[2] Sequimur plures codd. ut H I aa bb ee cum ed. 1 loco *boni* ponendo *doni*, quod tertio argumento in princ. huius quaestionis respondet. Paulo infra ex mss. antiquioribus et ed 1 substituimus *secundum quam* loco *secundum quod*.
[3] Ex cod. Z et ed. 1 substituimus *ad* pro minus apta

[1] In edition 1 there is added as an explanation *eternal emanation* [aeternal emanatione], in which a little below this together with some manuscripts, such as aa and bb, it also has the subjunctive forms for *is received*, and *is produced*. At the end of this proposition, the Vatican edition, having omitted the punctuation, continues the sentence with the following one.
[2] We follow the very many codices, such as H I aa bb and ee together with edition 1, by placing *gift* [doni] for *good* [boni], which corresponds to the third

praepositione *in*, quae et immediate post recurrens forte occasionem praebuit unum pro altero ponendi.
[4] Supplevimus *in aliquid*, quod et contextu exigitur et ipsa obiectione supra posita nec non auctoritate cod. Z comprobatur. Mox fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 *susceptivum* posuimus pro *receptivum*.
[5] Lectio Vat. *haec est duplex* emendatur ope mss. et ed. 1.
[6] Vetustiores codd. cum ed. 1 exhibent *santus*, omissum a Vat. et cod. cc.
[7] Ed. 1 *et sic*, quae et paulo post cum aliquibus mss. ut A aa cc ponit *procedat* loco *procedit*.
[8] Vat. contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 minus bene, verbis transpositis, *in tempore essendi*.
[9] Susbtituimus fide mss. (propter abbreviationem plures sunt dubiae lectionis) et ed. 1, nec non constructione grammaticali exigente, *liberi arbitrii* pro *liberum arbitrium*. — Explicationem verborum Augustini vide etiam infra d. 15. p. II. dub. 5.
[10] Pro syllogismo exprimitur hoc idem sequenti regula: Peiorem sequitur semper conclusio partem i. e. si una praemissarum fuerit particularis aut negativa, conclusio erit particularis aut negativa. — Paulo ante post *dicitur* exhibemus lectionem plurimorus mss. addendo *esse*, quod Vat. omittit cum ed. 1 et uno alterover codice. Ed. 1 cum cod. aa *iudicatur* loco *dicitur*, pro quo cod. V *erit* et cod. Y *est*.
[11] Cod. Y *si* pro *quod*.

argument in the beginning of this question. A little below this from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *according to that which* [secundum quod] in place of *according to which (procession)* [secundum quam].
[3] From codex Z and edition 1, we have substituted *to* [ad] for the less apt preposition *into* [in], which also recurring immediately after, perhaps offered the occasion of exchanging one for the other.
[4] We have supplied the *into something* [in aliquid], which is required also by the context and confirmed by its being placed in the very objection above, and not without the authority of codex Z. Then trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have placed *susceptive* [susceptivum] for *receptive* [receptivum].
[5] The reading of the Vatican edition, *that this (procession) is twofold* [quod haec est duplex] is emended with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1.
[6] The older codices together with edition 1 exhibit the *Holy* [sanctus], omitted by the Vatican edition and by codex cc.
[7] Edition 1 reads *and thus* [et sic], which also a little after this together with some manuscripts, such as A aa and cc, has the subjunctive form for *He proceeds*.
[8] The Vatican edition, contrary to the more ancient codices and to edition 1, has less well, with transposed words, *a starting-point in time of being* [initium in tempore essendi].
[9] We have substituted, trusting in the manuscripts, on account of abbreviation there are many dubious readings, and in edition 1, and not without the requirements of the grammatical construction, *(by reason) of free will* for *free will* [liberum arbitrium]. — For an explanation of the words of (St) Augustine see below in d. 15, p. II, dubium 5.
[10] The same is expressed for the syllogism according to the following rule: the conclusion always follows the worse part, i. e. if one of the premises was particular or negative, the conclusion will be particular or negative. — A little before this after *is said* [dicitur] we exhibit the reading of very many manuscripts by adding the *to be* [esse], which the Vatican edition omits, together with edition 1 and one or the other of the codices. Edition 1 together with codex aa has *is judged* [iudicatur] in place of the *is said* [dicitur], in place of which codex V has *will be* [erit] and codex Y *is* [est].
[11] Codex Y has *if* [si] for *because* [quod].

---

p. 247

impor- / -tatur nova realis habitudo ipsius termini ad Spiritum sanctum, cui respondet nova habitudo secundum dici in Spiritu sancto ad ipsum terminum. Sic cum talis habitudo sit ex tempore, dico, quod secundum hanc habitudinem vel ratione huius habitudinis Spiritus sanctus procedit ex tempore ».

a new real habitude of the terminus to the Holy Spirit, to which there corresponds a new habitude according to our manner of speaking [secundum dici] in the Holy Spirit to the terminus itself. Thus since such a habitude is on account of time [ex tempore], I say, that according to this habitude and/or by reason of this habitude the Holy Spirit proceeds in time [ex

tempore] ».

II. Ut solut. ad 2. melius intelligatur, supponendum est, quod idem Richard. (loc. cit. ad 1.) dicit: « Non est simile de generatione et processione, quia generatio importat tantum habitudinem ad principium *a quo*, sed processio Spiritus sancti non tantum importat habitudinem ad principium *a quo*, sed etiam ad terminum *ad quem*. Divina autem persona non potest importare habitudinem ad aliquid temporale sicut ad principium *a quo*; ergo non potest esse aliqua generatio divinae personae nisi ratione humanae naturae, quae non sit aeterna etc. ».

II. So that the solution to n. 2 be understood better, one must suppose, what the same Richard (loc. cit. ad 1) says: « It is not similar concerning generation and procession, because generation conveys only a habitude to the principle *from which*, but the procession of the Holy Spirit not only conveys a habitude to the principle *from which*, but also to the terminus *to which*. Moreover a Divine Person cannot convey a habitude to anything temporal, as to a principle *from which*; therefore there cannot be any (temporal) generation of a Divine Person except by reason of a human nature, which is not eternal etc. ».

III. Pro ampliore huis quaestionis dilucidatione serviunt quae sequuntur in hac et duabus seqq. qq. Cfr. etiam Breviloq. p. I. c. 5; Comment. in S. Ioan. c. 1. 34. (in Suppl. Bonelli tom. I.). Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 71. m. 2; et. q. 73. m . 1. — Scot., de hac et seq. in utroque scripto hic q. unic. — S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 1. 2.; S. I. q. 43. a. 1. 2. 6., 7. — B. Albert., hic a. 1. 10; S. I. tr. 7. q. 32. m. 1. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 1. 2. — Richard. a Med. hic a. 1. q. 1. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 1. — Henr. Gand., de hac et seq. S. a. 61. q. 2. n. 6; et q. 10. n. 6. seq. — Durand., hic q. 1. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1. — Biel, de hac et seq. hic q. 1.

III. For a more ample elucidation of this question see what follows in this article and the following two questions. Cf. also Breviloquium p. I, c. 5; Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, chs. 1 and 34. (in Bonelli's Supplement, tom. I.). Alexander of Hales, Summa. p. I, q. 71, m. 2; and in q. 73 m. 1. — (Bl. John Duns) Scotus, on this and the following question in either writing, here in the q. sole. — St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 1 and 2.; Summa., I, q. 43, aa. 1, 2, 6 and 7. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in aa. 1 and 10; Summa. I, tr. 7, q. 32, m. 1. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, aa. 1 and 2. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. princ., q. 1. — Henry of Ghent., on this and the following question, Summa., a. 61, q. 2, n. 6; and q. 10, n. 6 ff. — Durandus, here in q. 1. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1. — (Gabriel) Biel, on this and the following question, here in q. 1.

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIV.

ARTICULUS I.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 247-248.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum processio Spiritus sancti aeterna et temporalis numerentur ut duae processiones.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum processio temporalis ponat in numerum cum aeterna. Et quod sic, videtur:

1. Per hoc, quod dicit Magister,[1] « quod *gemina* est processio Spiritus sancti, aeterna et temporalis ».

2. Item, *ratione* videtur similiter, quia plus distat[2] temporale ab aeterno quam aeternum ab aeterno; illud constat; sed processio aeterna facit numerum cum aeterna, quia processio Filii et processio Spiritus sancti sunt duae: ergo etc.

3. Item, quaecumque habent ordinem, habent numerum et distinctionem; sed processio aeterna et temporalis habent ordinem, quia aeterna[3] ante temporalem: ergo habent distinctionem; ergo faciunt numerum: ergo processio temporalis et aeterna sunt duae.

Contra: 1. Numerata processione, numeratur procedens, quia unum et idem

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIV

ARTICLE I

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 247-248.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 2

Whether the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit and the temporal are to be numbered as two processions.

Second there is asked, whether the temporal procession counts [ponat] in number with the eternal. And that it is, seems:

1. Through this, which Master (Peter) says,[1] « that there is a *twin* procession of the Holy Spirit, the eternal and the temporal ».

2. Likewise, *by reason* it seems similarly, because the temporal is more distant[2] from the eternal than the eternal from the temporal; that is established; but an eternal procession with (another) eternal (procession) increases [facit] the number, because the procession of the Son and the procession of the Holy Spirit are two [processions]: ergo etc..

3. Likewise, whatsoever (things) have an order, have a number and a distinction; but the eternal and temporal procession have an order, because the eternal (is)[3] before the temporal: therefore they have a distinction; therefore they increase the number: therefore the temporal and eternal procession are two (processions).

On the contrary: 1. With the processions numbered, the one proceeding is

non procedit bis; ergo si sunt duae processiones, sunt duo procedentes: ergo Spiritus sancti sunt duo;[4] sed hoc est falsum, quia unus est Spiritus sanctus procedens: ergo et primum.

numbered, because one and the same does not proceed twice; therefore if there are two processions, there are two proceeding: therefore there are two Holy Spirits;[4] but this is false, because the Holy Spirit proceeding is One: therefore also the first (proposition is false).

2. Item, processio temporalis et aeterna si differunt, aut hoc est ex hoc, quod sunt diversae emanationes, aut quia diversus modus emanandi. Non quia diversae emanationes, quia tunc essent diversi emanantes; nec quia diversus modus, quia Pater et Filius semper uno modo spirant: ergo Spiritus sanctus semper[5] uno modo procedit: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, the temporal procession and the eternal, if they differ, either this is from this, that they are diverse emanations, or because (there is) a diverse manner of emanating. Not because (they are) diverse emanations, because then there would be diverse (ones) emanating; nor because a diverse manner, because the Father and the Son spirate always in one manner: therefore the Holy Spirit always[5] proceeds in one manner: ergo etc..

3. Item, homo pictus et homo verus non sunt duo homines; non enim numerantur nisi univoca, et quod dicitur de duobus secundum unam naturam;[6] sed temporale et aeternum minus communicant quam homo pictus et homo verus: ergo processio temporalis et aeterna non est dicenda *gemina*.

3. Likewise, a man depicted and a true man are not two men; for they are not numbered except univocally, and because ("man") is said of the two according to (their) one nature;[6] but the temporal and eternal communicate less than a man depicted and a true man: therefore the temporal procession and the eternal are not to be said (to be) *twin* (processions).

4. Item, processio temporalis non addit super aeternam nisi respectum vel effectum in creatura;[7] sed respectus vel effectus, causae additus, ipsam non numerat: unde sol lucens et sol illustrans sive illuminans non sunt duo, similiter Deus ens et Deus creans: ergo nec processio aeterna et temporalis erit duplex.[8]

4. Likewise, the temporal procession does not add (anything) above the eternal except a looking-back and/or effect in the creature;[7] but a looking-back and/or effect, added to a cause, does not number it: whence the Sun shining [lucens] and the Sun brightening [illustrans] or illuminating are not two, similarly God being and God creating: therefore neither shall the eternal procession and the temporal be twofold.[8]

CONCLUSIO.

Secundum modum dicendi analogum non inconvenienter processio Spiritus sancti aeterna et temporalis dicitur duplex processio.

CONCLUSION

According to an analogous manner of speaking the eternal and temporal procession of the Holy Spirit is not unfittingly said (to be) a twofold procession.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod ad praedictorum intelligentiam est notandum, quod processio dicitur geminari aut ratione *procedentium*, ut puta, cum procedunt duo filii; aut ratione *modi procedendi*,[9] ut amore et verbum dupliciter procedunt; vel ratione *modi dicendi*, ut dicatur processio gemina, id est dupliciter dicta.

I respond: It must be said, that for an understanding of the aforesaid there must be noted, that a procession is said "to be doubled" [geminari] either by reason of *the ones proceeding*, as for example, when two sons proceed; or by reason of *the manner of proceeding*,[9] as love and word proceed in a twofold manner; and/or by reason *of a manner of speaking*, as a procession is said (to be) a "twin" (generation), that is said in

Sed attendendum, quod modus dicendi est triplex, scilicet *aequivocus*, *univocus* et *analogus*.[10] Cum est modus dicendi *aequivocus*, ibi est geminatio circa *dici* et non circa *esse*. Unde homo pictus et homo verus *dupliciter* dicitur homo, sed non est duplex homo vel duo homines. Cum est modus dicendi *univocus*, est geminatio circa *esse* et non . . .

twofold manner.

But one must attend, that there is a threefold manner of speaking, namely the *equivocal*, the *univocal* and the *analogous*.[10] When there is an *equivocal* manner of speaking, there is a doubling about the '*being said*' and not about *'being*'. Whence a man depicted and a true man are said (to be) a "man" *in a twofold manner*, but there is not a twofold man and/or two men. When there is an *univocal* manner of speaking, there is a doubling about *'being*' and not . . .

---

[1] Hic, c. 1.
[2] Cod. M *differt*.
[3] In cod. Y additur *est*.
[4] Ed. 1 *ergo duo Spiritus*.
[5] Ex mss. et ed. 1 restituimus male omissum *semper*.
[6] Vide Aristot., IV. Phys. text. 133. (c. ult.) et V. Metaph. text. 11. et 20. (IV. c. 6. et 15.).
[7] Plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 *creaturam*, quod refertur ad *respectum*.
[8] Consentientibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, substituimus *duplex* loco *dupliciter*.
[9] In Vat. et cod. cc perperam deest *procedendi*, quod tamen habetur in aliis codd. et ed. 1.
[10] Cfr. Aristot., de Praedicam. in princ. — Mox post *modus* fide vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 adiecimus incongrue omissum *dicendi*. Dein ed. 1 *Ut* loco *Unde*.

[1] Here in ch. 1.
[2] Codex M has *differs more* [plus differt] instead of *is more distant* [plus distat].
[3] In codex Y there is added an *is* [est]
[4] Edition 1 reads *therefore two Spirits* [ergo duo Spiritus].
[5] From the manuscripts and edition 1, we have restores the badly omitted *always* [semper].
[6] See Aristotle, Physics, Bk. IV, text 133 (last chapter), and Metaphysics, Bk. V, texts 11 and 20 (Bk. IV, chs. 6 and 15)
[7] Very many codices together with edition 1 read *unto the creature* [in creaturam], which refers to *a looking-back* [respectum].
[8] With the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 consenting, we have substituted *twofold* [duplex] in place of *in a twofold manner* [dupliciter].
[9] In the Vatican edition and codex cc there is faultily absent the *of proceeding* [procedendi], which, however, is had in the other codices and in edition 1.
[10] Cf. Aristotle, On the Predicaments, at the beginning. — Then after *manner* [modus], trusting in the older manuscripts and in edition 1, we have inserted the incongruously omitted *of speaking* [dicendi]. Then edition 1 has *Such as* [Ut] in place of *Whence* [Unde].

---

p. 248

circa *dici*.[1] Unde homo verus in Socrate et Platone numeratur, quia sunt duo homines, sed non multipliciter dicitur. Ubi est modus dicendi *analogus*, quia partem tenet de natura univoci, partem de natura aequivoci, ibi est numeratio et[2] in essendo et in dicendo.

Secundum hunc igitur modum dicendum, quod *processio*, secundum quod dicta est de processione temporali et aeterna, non est dicta[3] univoce nec aequivoce, sed *analogice*, quia unus modus clauditur in alio. *Procedere* enim ab hoc in hoc ut in

about *being-said*.[1] Whence a true man is numbered in Socrates and in Plato, because there are two men, but it is not said in a multiplied manner. Where there is an *analogous* manner of speaking, because it has part from the nature of the univocal, part from the nature of the equivocal, there is a numbering both[2] in being [in essendo] and in saying.

According to this manner, therefore, it must be said, that *procession*, according to which it is said of the temporal and eternal procession, is not said[3] univocally nor equivocally, but *analogically*, because one manner is closed in the other. For *to*

obiectum est aeternum, sed *procedere* ab hoc in hoc ut in *habitaculum* est temporale. Quoniam igitur analogum est sic dictum et sic,[4] ideo est ibi dupliciter dici, et una processio dicitur dupliciter, et ita per consequens duplex esse, ut non inconvenienter dicatur processio Spiritus sancti esse duplex.

proceed from this into that as into *an object* is the eternal one, but *to proceed* from this into that as into *a little dwelling* is the temporal. Therefore, since the analogous is said (to proceed) in this manner and in that manner,[4] for that reason there is a twofold being-said there, and “one procession” is said in a twofold manner, and thus as a consequence a twofold ‘being’, so that not unfittingly is the procession of the Holy Spirit said to be twofold.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur in contrarium, quod, multiplicata processione, multiplicatur procedens; dicendum, quod verum est, si accipiatur de multiplicatione secundum unum modum dicendi. Unde si gemina esset processio, secundum quod processio dicitur exitus ab aliquo, utique duo essent procedentes, nunc autem[5] non sic; sed est *gemina*, quia uno modo est ab aliquo in aliquem ut in *obiectum*, alio modo ab aliquo in aliquem ut in *habitaculum*.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected in the Contrary, that, with the procession multiplied, the one proceeding is multiplied; it must be said, that it is true, if it is accepted of multiplication according to one manner of speaking. Whence if there were a twin procession, according to which procession is said (to be) a going-forth from something, indeed there would be two proceeding, but[5] (it is) not now (being considered) in this manner; on the other hand, there is a *twin* (procession), because in one manner it is from Someone into Someone as into *an Object*, in another manner from Someone into someone as into *a little dwelling*.

2. 3. Ad illud quod obiicitur secundo: *aut* est duplex processio, quia duplex emanatio *vel* duplex modus;[6] dicendum, quod non sufficienter dividit; debet enim tertium membrum addere, scilicet, *aut* quia duplex modus dicendi, non aequivocus. Et per hoc patet sequens de homine picto et vero, quia ibi non est analogia, sed aequivocatio pura.

2. 3. To that which is objected second: *either* the procession is twofold, because (there is) a twofold emanation *and/or* a twofold manner (of proceeding);[6] it must be said, that he does not divide it sufficiently; for he ought to add a third member, namely, *either* because (it is) a twofold manner of speaking, not an equivocal one. And through this the following one concerning the man depicted and the true one, because there is not an analogy there, but a pure equivocation.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur ultimo, quod respectus additus non numerat etc.; dicendum, quod respectus additus *subiecto* non numerat subiectum; unde non dicitur Spiritus sanctus duplex,[7] quia spiratur et inspiratur. Sed quando respectus additur *significationi termini*, tunc necesse est, illum aliter et aliter dici; et si sit respectus non distrahens — ita quod non faciat omnino diversam significationem — sed ad illam ordinatus, facit analogiam in termino[8] et numerum secundum *dici* et etiam numerum secundum *esse*. Unde si hoc nomen *illuminatio* significaret actum lucendi *absolutum* et actum lucendi *comparatum*,

4. To that which is objected last, that an added looking-back does not number etc.; it must be said, that a looking-back added to a *subject* does number the subject; whence the Holy Spirit is not said (to be) twofold,[7] because He is spirated and breathed into. But when a looking-back is added *to the signification of a term*, then it is necessary, that it be said (both) in one and the other manner; and if the looking-back is not distracting — such that it does not cause an entirely diverse signification — but (is) ordered to it, it causes an analogy in the term[8] and a number according to *being-said* and even a number according to *‘being*’.

sol dupliciter deceretur illuminare, et esset illuminatio solis gemina; sed tamen magis proprie ibi esset geminatio in *dicendo* quam in *essendo*. Unde Magister[9] magis proprie loqueretur, si diceret: processio Spiritus sancti dicitur dupliciter, quam cum dicit, quod est gemina, quia non cadit ibi proprie geminatio.

Whence if this noun "*illumination*" would signify the *absolute* act of shining and the *compared* act of shining, the Sun would be said "to illuminate" in a twofold manner, and there would be a twin illumination by the Sun [solis]; but, nevertheless, more properly would there be a doubling in *saying* than in *'being'*. Whence Master (Peter)[9] would speak more properly, if he would say: "the procession of the Holy Spirit is said in a twofold manner", than when he says, that there is a twin (procession), because a doubling does not properly occur there.

SCHOLION.

I. Ponere in numerum cum alio idem est ac distingui ut res a re. Notandum autem, quod haec utruisque processionis distinctio sane est intelligenda. Nam temporalis processio includit aeternam et addit super eam in Spiritu sancto novam habitudinem (secundum rationem intelligendi) ad creaturam, connotando aliquem realem effectum in ipsa, per quem est nova relatio realis in creatura ad Spiritum sanctum. Inde sequitur, quod *termini* istarum processionum essentialiter differunt, quia aeterna processio non respicit nisi terminum aeternum, temporalis vero importat respectum ad terminum temporalem. Sed in *essentia* istarum processionum non alia est differentia nisi secundum rationem intelligendi, ut bene explicat Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 2. — De triplici modo dicendi: univoco, aequivoco et analogo cfr. supra d. 1. a. 3. q. 1 et Scholion. — Ad intelligentiam conclusionis multum iuvat solut. ad 4; cfr. etiam infra d. 15. p. II, et d. 16.

II. Omnes antiqui Scholastici in conclusione concordant, excepto Aegid. R., qui negat, dici posse processionem esse geminam vel duplicem. S. Thom., hic q. 1. a. 2; S. I. q. 43. a. 2. ad. 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 7. 9; S. p. I. tr. 7. q. 32. m. 2. a. 2. — Petr. a Tar., hic. q. 1. a. 4. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 1. q. 2. — Aegid. R., hic 1. princ. q. 2. — Durand., hic q. 2. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 1. post med.

SCHOLIUM

I. "To count in number with something" [ponere in numerum cum alio] is the same as "to be distinguished as a thing from a thing". Moreover, it must be noted, that this distinction of each procession must be understood in a sane manner. For the temporal procession includes the eternal one and adds upon it a new habitude in the Holy Spirit (according to the reckoning of understanding) to the creature, by connoting some real effect in it, through which there is a new, real relation in the creature to the Holy Spirit. Hence it follows, that *the terms* of these two processions of His differ essentially, because the eternal procession does not look back except to an eternal terminus, but the temporal conveys a looking-back to a temporal terminus. But in the *essence* of these processions there is not other difference except according to the reckoning of the understanding, as Richard of Middleton well explains, here in a. 1, q. 2. — On the threefold manner of speaking: the univocal, equivocal and the analogous, cf. above d. 1, a. 3, q. 1 and its Scholium. — For an understanding of the conclusion the solution to n. 4 helps a great deal; cf. also d. 15, p. II, and d. 16.

II. All the ancient Scholastics agree in the conclusion, except Giles the Roman, who denies, that there can be said to be a twin and/or twofold procession. St. Thomas, here in q. 1, a. 2; Summa., I, q. 43, a. 2, ad 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in aa. 7 and 9; Summa., p. I, tr. 7, q. 32, m. 2, a. 2. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in qq. 1 and 4. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 1, q. 2. — Giles the Roman, here in 1st. princ. q. 2. — Durandus, here in q. 2.

— (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 1, in the second half.

[1] Lectio Vat. *dicere* pro *dici* castigatur ope mss. et ed. 1. Paulo ante cod. W *sed non* loco *et non*.
[2] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 omittit *et*. Codd. L O *geminatio* loco *numeratio*.
[3] Vat. cum cod. cc praeter fidem antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 male omittit *dicta*.
[4] Ita cum ed. 1 omnes codd., licet aliqui ut K O V X falso prima vice pro *sic* legant *sicut*, sed Vat. omnino pertubatae *sicut dictum est* pro *sic dictum et sic* i. e. procedere uno modo dictum et altero modo. Mox codd. et edd. non conveniunt inter se ponendo *duplex* loco *dupliciter* et vice versa.
[5] In Vat. et cod. cc minus apte omittitur *autem*, quod in aliis codd. et ed. 1 habetur. Mox in plurimis codd. et sex primis edd. post *sed* desideratur verbum *est*.
[6] Praecedens propositio clarius exhiberetur sic: *obiicitur secundo: est duplex processio, quia aut duplex emanatio aut duplex modus*; consentientibus tamen cum Vat. editionibus et codicibus (excepto cod. H, qui post *vel* repetit *quia*) nihil mutavimus.
[7] Vat. contra plures codd. ut F T X Y *dupliciter*. Paulo infra in margine cod. T a posteriore manu post *termini* glossando ponitur *ut videlicet quia terminus in una sui significatione est absolutus, in alia respectivus*.
[8] Multi codd. ut A B C D E F G I P Q R S T U etc. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 loco *in termino* ponunt *in tertio*, de quo cfr. supra d. 1. a. 3. q. 1. ad 1, et infra d. 35. q. 1. in corp. Paulo ante ed. 1 *illum* pro *illam*.
[9] Cfr. lit. Magistri, hic c. 1. in initio.

[1] The reading of the Vatican edition, *saying* [dicere] for *being-said* [dici], is corrected with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1. A little before this codex W has *but not* [sed non] in place of *not* [non].
[2] The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, omits *both* [et]. Codices L and O have *doubling* [geminatio] in place of *numbering* [numeratio].
[3] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, not trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, badly omits *said* [dicta].
[4] Thus with edition 1 all the codices, though some, such as K O V and X, falsely the first time read *just as* [sic] for *in this manner* [sic], but the reading of the Vatican edition is entirely distorted, *just as has been said* [sicut dictum est] for *in this manner said and in that manner* [sic dictum et sic], i.e. is said to proceed in this manner and in the other manner. Then the codices and editions do not agree amongst themselves, by putting *twofold* [duplex] in place of *in a twofold manner* [dupliciter] and vice versa.
[5] In the Vatican edition and codex cc, there is less aptly omitted the *but* [autem], which in the other codices and edition 1 is had. Then in very many codices and the six first editions, after *but* [sed] there is wanting the verb *it is* [est].
[6] The preceding proposition is more clearly exhibited in this manner: *there is objected second: there is a twofold procession, because either the emanation (is) twofold or the manner twofold*; yet with the editions and codices agreeing with the Vatican edition (except codex H, which after *and/or* [vel] repeats *that* [quia]), we have changed nothing.
[7] The Vatican edition, contrary to very many codices, such as F T X and Y, has *in a twofold manner* [dupliciter]. A little below this in the margin, codex T in a later hand after *of a term* [termini], glossing, puts *such as, namely, because the term in one of its significations is absolute, in another respective* [*ut videlicet quia terminus in una sui significatione est absolutus, in alia respectivus*].
[8] Many codices, such as A B C D E F G I P Q R S T U etc. together with editions 1, 2, 3 , in place of *in the term* [in termino] have *in the third* [in tertio], concerning which cf. above d. 1, a. 3, q. 1, in reply to n. 1, and below in d. 35, q. 1, in the body (of the response). A little before this edition 1 has *it* [illum], i.e. the *term,* for *it* [illam], i.e. the *signification*.
[9] Cf. text of Master (Peter), here in ch. 1, at the beginning.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIV.

ARTICULUS II.

Quaestio I.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 249-250.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIV

ARTICLE II

Question 1

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 249-250.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

ARTICULUS II.

De datione Spiritus sancti.

Consequenter est secundo loco quaestio principalis de datione Spiritus sancti. Et circa hoc quaeruntur duo.

Primo quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus detur in propria persona hominibus, an tantum dicatur ideo dari, quia datur eius effectus.

Secundo, utrum Spiritus sanctus detur ab aliquo viro sancto.

ARTICLE II

On the giving of the Holy Spirit.

Consequently, in second place is the principal question concerning the giving of the Holy Spirit. And about this four (questions) are asked.

First there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit is given in His own Person to men, or whether His is only said to be given for this reason, that His effect is given.

Second, whether the Holy Spirit is given by any holy man.

QUAESTIO I.

Utrum Spritus sanctus detur in propria persona, an tantum in effectu.

Quod detur in propria persona, sic ostenditur.

1. Ad Romanos quinto:[1] *Caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum sanctum, qui datus est nobis*; sed nihil diffundit caritatem nisi Spiritus increatus: ergo etc.

2. Item, Augustinus quinto de Trinitate[2]

QUESTION 1

Whether the Holy Spirit is given in His own Person, or whether only in effect.

That he is given in His own Person, is shown in this manner:

1. From the fifth (chapter of the Letter of St. Paul) to the Romans:[1] *The charity of God has been poured out in our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us*; but nothing pours out charity except the uncreated Spirit: ergo etc..

2. Likewise, (St.) Augustine in the fifth

dicit, quod Spiritus sanctus est donum, et eo dicitur donum, quia datur: ergo si personaliter est donum, personaliter datur.

(book) On the Trinity[2] says, that the Holy Spirit is a gift, and is said to be a gift for this reason, that He is given: therefore if He personally is a gift, He personally is given.

3. Item, hoc ipsum ostenditur *ratione*. Spiritus sanctus est amor et primus amor; sed amor est donum primum, in quo omnia[8] alia dona donantur: ergo si non est ponere posterius sine priori, non est ponere dona Spiritus sancti dari, quin detur ipse Spiritus sanctus.

3. Likewise, this very (thing) is shown *by reason*: The Holy Spirit is love and the first Love, but love is the first gift, in which all[3] other (gifts) are bestowed: therefore if there is not a positing of the posterior without the prior, there is not a positing that the gifts of the Holy Spirit are given, unless the Holy Spirit Himself be given.

4. Item, Spiritus sanctus datur ad uniendum[4] et colligandum membra corporis mystici; sed membra corporis mystici sunt membra invicem unita, sicut ipse Dominus petit, Ioannis decimo septimo:[5] *Ut sint consummati in unum*; sed perfecta unio non est nisi in uno simplici: ergo membra uniuntur per aliquid, quod est unum et idem in omnibus; hoc autem non potest esse donum creatum, sed increatum: ergo necesse est cum dono creato dari increatum.

4. Likewise, the Holy Spirit is given to unite[4] and bind together [colligandum] the members of the Mystical Body; but the members of the Mystical Body are members united to one another, just as the Lord sought, in the seventeenth (chapter of the Gospel) of (St.) John:[5] *That they might all be taken up together into the one (Body)*; but a perfect union is not but in one simple (thing): therefore the members are united through something, which is one and the same in all; but this cannot be a created gift, but (rather) an uncreated one: therefore it is necessary that with the created gift the Uncreated be given.

Contra: 1. Virtus[6] est ars recte vivendi, et gratia est donum sufficienter dirigens animam in finem: ergo videtur, quod aliud donum quam donum gratiae creatae non sit animae opportunum: ergo si non est in operibus Dei ponendum superfluum,[7] patet quod non est necesse dari Spiritum sanctum.

On the contrary: 1. Virtue[6] is the art of living uprightly, and grace is the gift sufficiently directing the soul unto (its) End: therefore it seems, a gift other than the gift of created grace is not opportune for the soul: therefore if one must not posit among the works of God (anything) superflouous,[7] it is clear that it is not necessary that the Holy Spirit be given.

2. Item, cum aliquis sanctificatur per gratiam, nihil est in eo praeter gratiam,[8] quod non esset prius: ergo cum dare sit facere, quod aliquid sit in isto, quod non erat prius, non datur nisi gratia. *Si dicas*, quod Spiritus sanctus in eo ut sanctus, prius erat ut Spiritus: ergo nihil aliud est quam Spiritum sanctum facere[9] gratiam sanctificantem in hoc.

2. Likewise, since everyone [aliquis] is sanctified through grace, there is nothing in any such [in eo] besides the grace,[8] which was not there before: therefore since "to give" is "to cause, something [aliquod] which is in it, which was not before", naught is given but grace. *If you say*, that the Holy Spirit (is) in any such [in eo] as the Holy One, (but) before (was there) as the Spirit: therefore it is nothing other than that Holy Spirit causes[9] the grace of sanctification in him.

3. Item, quod datur post donationem est in potestate accipientis; sed Spiritus sanctus sub nullius[10] potest redigi potestate: ergo non potest dari.

3. Likewise, what is given after the donation is in the power of the one accepting; but the Holy Spirit cannot be brought down beneath the power of anyone [nullius]:[10] therefore He cannot be given.

4. Item, quod datur alicui differenti per essentiam aut de novo creatur, aut multiplicatur, aut eius possessio transfertur, ut patet, cum do alicui cappam; sed persona Spiritus sancti nec creatur nec multiplicatur nec possessio eius transfertur, quia Deus semper habet Spiritum sanctum: ergo Spiritus sanctus non datur.

4. Likewise, what is given to anyone differing through essence either is created anew, or multiplied, or is transferred to his possession, as is clear, when I give a cape to anyone, but the Person of the Holy Spirit is neither created nor multiplied nor transferred to his possession, because God always has the Holy Spirit: therefore the Holy Spirit is not given.

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus datur tum in propria persona, tum in dono creato, quod est gratia.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit is given both in His own Person, and in the created gift, which is grace.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod *dare* est ad aliquid habendum vel possidendum; *habere* autem aliquid vel possidere est, cum aliquid est in facultate habentis vel possidentis. *Esse* autem *in facultate habentis* vel possidentis est esse praesto ad fuendum vel utendum. Perfecta autem possessio est, cum homo habet illud, quo possit uti et quo possit frui.[11] Sed recte frui non est nisi Deo, et recte uti non contingit nisi per gratiam gratam facientem:

I respond: It must be said, that '*to give*' is for the having and/or possessing of something; but '*to have* and/or possess something' is, when something is in the faculty of the one having and/or possessing. Moreover '*to be in the faculty of the one having* and/or possessing' is 'to be at hand [esse praesto] for enjoying and/or using'. But perfect possession is, when a man has that, which he can use and which he can enjoy.[11] But there is no upright enjoying except of God, and no upright using except through the grace that makes one pleasing [per gratiam gratam facientem]:

---

[1] Vers. 5.
[2] Cap. 15. n. 16: Spiritus sanctus eo quo datur, habet non tantum ut donum sit, sed omnino ut sit. Cfr. etiam infra d. XVIII. lit. Magistri. — Mox. post *ergo si* cod. bb *persona haec* loco *personaliter*.
[3] Fide antiquiorum mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus hic *omnia* et paulo post *ponere*. Circa finem argumenti ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 loco *proprie* substituimus *ipse*. Plura de hoc argumento vide infra d. 18. q. 1.
[4] Codd. L O *vivificandum* pro *uniendum*.
[5] Vers. 23.
[6] Ita recte omnes codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. habet *Gratia*.
[7] Aristot., I. de Caelo et mundo, text. 32. (c. 4): Deus autem et natura nihil frustra faciunt.
[8] Sequimur cod. T ponendo *praeter gratiam* loco *nisi gratia*, quod multi codd. cum edd. 1, ,2 3, male omittunt.
[9] Sequimur plures Codd., licet aliqui ut A S T V etc. minus bene *facientem*; Vat. *Spiritus sanctus faciens*.
[10] Ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 restittuimus *nullius* pro *nulla*. Mox cod. bb *nec* loco *non*.
[11] Praeter fidem vetustiorum mss. et ed. 1 minus bene Vat. bis *posset* loco *possit*. Mox cod. K *alio quam* et cod. T *in alio a* pro primo *nisi*.

[1] Verse 5.
[2] Chapter 15, n. 16: The Holy Spirit for the reason that He is given, has not only that He is a gift, but entirely that He is. Cf. also below in Master (Peter's) Book of Sentences, Bk. I, d. 18. — Then after *therefore* [ergo] codex bb has *this person* [persona haec] in place of *He personally* [personaliter].
[3] Trusting in the more ancient manuscripts and in edition 1, we have supplied here *all* [omnia] and a little after this *a positing of* [ponere]. Near the end fo the argument, from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *Himself* [ipse] in place of *properly* [proprie]. See more on this argument below in d. 18, q. 1.
[4] Codices L and O have *vivify* [vivificandum] for *unite* [uniendum].
[5] Verse 23.
[6] Thus rightly all the codices, together with edition 1, while the Vatican edition has *Grace* [Gratia].
[7] Aristotle, On Heaven and Earth, Bk. I, text 32 (ch. 4): But God and nature do nothing in vain.
[8] We follow codex T by putting *besides the grace* [praeter gratiam] in place of *except grace* [nisi gratia], which many codices together with editions 1, 2, and 3, badly omit.
[9] We follow the very many codices, though some, such as A S T V etc. have the less well *causing* [facientem]; the Vatican edition has the secondary clause in direct speech, rather than indirect.

[10] From the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1 we have restored *the power of any one* [potestate nullius] for *any power* [nulla potestate]. Then codex bb has *neither* [nec] for the *not* [non].
[11] Not trusting in the older manuscripts and edition 1, the Vatican edition has less well, twice, *could* [posset] for *can* [possit]. Then codex K has *of an other than* [alio quam], and codex T has *in another than* [in alio a], for the first *except* [nisi].

---

p. 250

ergo perfecta possessio est, in qua Deus habetur et eius gratia. Sed perfectum donum est ad perfectam possessionem: ergo non est *datum optimum et donum perfectum*,[1] nisi detur Donum increatum, quod est Spiritus sanctus, et donum creatum, quod est gratia. Concedendum ergo est,[2] utrumque dari.

therefore perfect is the possession, in which God and His grace are had. But the perfect gift is for the perfect possession: therefore there not a *best given and a perfect gift*,[1] except there be given the uncreated Gift, which is the Holy Spirit, and the created gift, which is grace. Therefore one must conceded,[2] that each is given.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur de gratia, quod est ars bene vivendi;[3] patet responsio: quamvis enim sit ars, qua utimur, non tamen est possessio, qua fruimur ut obiecto; et ideo non est perfectum donum sine illo.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected concerning grace, which is the art of living well;[3] the response is clear: for though it is the art, which we use, yet it is not the possession, which we enjoy as object; and for that reason there is not a perfect gift without Him.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur: nihil plus est in isto quam prius; dicendum, quod dari non ordinatur ad *esse*, sed ad *habere*. Licet enim Spiritus sanctus esset prius in peccatore, non tamen habebatur ab eo, quia peccator non habebat facultatem fruendi ipso.

2. To that which is objected: nothing more is in such a one than (was) before; it must be said, that 'being given' is not ordered to '*being*', but to '*having*'. For even though the Holy Spirit was in the sinner before, yet He was not had by him, because the sinner did not have the faculty of enjoying Him.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod datum est in potestate accipientis; dicendum, quod aliquid datur alicui ut *finiens*, sicut praemium merenti; aliquid ut *perficiens*, ut gratia consentienti; aliquid ut *subserviens*, ut equus militi. Quod autem dicitur, quod datum est in potestate accipientis, verum est de datione**4** tertio modo dicta, non primo et secundo, quia illi sunt duo modi habendi, in quibus habens habetur. Unde homo habetur a gratia et habetur a Dono, quo fruitur.

3. To that which is objected, that the given is in the power of the one accepting, it must be said, that something is given to someone as *one finishing*, just as the reward to the one meriting; something as *one perfecting*, as grace to the one consenting; something as *one subserving*, as the horse to the soldier. But that which is said, that the given is in the power of the one accepting, is true of giving[4] said in the third manner, not in the first and second, because those are two manners of having, in which the one having is had. Whence man is had by grace and is had by the Gift, which he enjoys.

4. Ex hoc patet ultimum: quia[5] illud verum est de eo quod datur ut possessio *limitata*; sed de eo quod datur ut *finiens*, non, quia tale simul potest dari multis et haberi a multis, quia ad idem tendunt; et ideo, cum datur, non transfertur.[6]

4. From this the last is clear: because[5] that is true of that, which is given as a *limited* possession; but of that which is given as *one finishing*, (it is) not, because such can at once be given to many and had by many, because they tend to the same; and for that

reason, when it is given, it is not transferred.[6]

SCHOLION.

I. Mira brevitate et claritate haec quaestio sex propositionibus solvitur et probatur. — In quarta propositione dicitur: « Recte uti non contingit nisi per gratiam »; hic vocabulum *recte* significat *meritorie*. Non enim negat S. Doctor, quod etiam peccator aliqua re possit recte uti, i.e. *honesto* modo, immo contrarium asserit II. Sent. d. 28. a. 2. q. 3.

II. In solutione ad 2. recte dicitur, quod « licet Spiritus sanctus esset prius in peccatore, non tamen habebatur ab eo ». Solummodo enim per caritatem creatura intellectualis et habetur speicali modo a Spiritu sancto et habet ipsum ad fruendum. Hoc explicat Richard. a Med. (hic a. 2. q. 1.) hac similitudine: « Si homo pauper haberet alicuius divitis pecuniam in sua domo, non propter hoc diceremus, quod haberet illam pecuniam sicut rem suam. Unde non obstante, quod illa pecunia praesens erat in domo pauperis, posset sibi dari de novo a divite; quo facto non tantum modo haberet eam per solam pecuniae praesentiam in domo, sed haberet eam sicut rem suam. A simili aliqualiter dico, quod quamvis Spiritus sanctus sit per essentiam praesens omni rei, quia tamen peccator non habet facultatem ad fuendum eo, ideo, non obstante illa praesentia, potest a Deo vere dari persona Spiritus sancti etc. ». — Attentione digna est etiam doctrina in solut. ad 3, qua declaratur, nec donum incratum ullatenus transferri in potestatem accipientis ut aliquid ipsi subiectum, nec ipsam animam corpori datam per hoc proprie subiici eiusdem potestati.

III. Cfr. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 73. m. 4. a. 1. — S. Thom., hic q. 2. a. 1; S. I. q. 42. a. 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 13; et d. 15. a. 2. ad 1; de hac et seq. q. S. p. I. tr. 7. q. 32. m. 1. q. 1. et 2. incidens. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 5. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 1. —

SCHOLIUM

I. With wonderful brevity and clarity this question is solved and proven in six propositions. — In the fourth proposition there is said: « Upright using does not happen except through grace »; here the word *upright* [recte] signifies *in a meritorious manner*. For the Seraphic Doctor does not deny, that the sinner can even use something in an upright manner, i. e. in an *honest* manner, nay rather he asserts the contrary in Sent., Bk. II, d. 28, a. 2, q. 3.

II. In solution to n. 2 there is rightly said, that « even though the Holy Spirit was in the sinner before, yet He was not had by him ». For only through charity is the intellectual creature both had in a special manner by the Holy Spirit and has Him to enjoy. This Richard of Middleton (here in a. 2, q. 1) explains with this similitude: « If a poor man had the money of some rich man in his own home, we would not say on this account, that he had that that money as his own. Whence notwithstanding, that that money was present in the home of the poor man, it could be given him a new by the rich man; which having been done, he would not only have it now through the presence alone of the money in his home, but he would have it as his own. In a somewhat similar manner I say, that although the Holy Spirit is through (His) Essence present to every thing, yet because the sinner does not have the faculty to enjoy Him, for that reason, notwithstanding that presence, the Person of the Holy Spirit can truly be given by God etc.. ». — Worthy of attention is the doctrine in the solution to n. 3, by which there is declared, that neither is the uncreated Gift to any extent transferred into the power of the one accepting as something subjected to him, nor that having been given as the soul itself to the body is He properly subjected through this to the power of the same.

III. Cf. Alexander of Hales, Summa. p. I, q. 73, m. 4, a. 1. — St. Thomas, here in q. 2, a. 1; Summa. I, q. 42, a. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 13; and in d. 15, a. 2, in reply to n. 1; on this and the following question, see his Summa., p. I, tr.

Aegid. R., hic 2. princ. q. 1. — Durand., hic q. 3. — Dionys. Carth., hic quaestiunc. 2. — Biel, hic q. 2.

7, q. 32, m. 1, qq. 1 and 2, in passing. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 5. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 2, q. 1. — Giles the Roman, here in 2nd. princ., q. 1. — Durandus, here in q. 3. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in quaestiunc. 2. — (Gabriel) Biel, here in q. 2.

---

[1] Iac. 1, 17.
[2] Vat., obnitentibus mss. et ed. 1, omittit *est*.
[3] Hoc enim eruitur ex propositione prima obiectionis.
[4] Vat. contra mss. et ed. 1 *donatione* loco *datione*, et paulo infra contra antiquiores codd. et ed. 1 omittit *duo*, deinde post *habens* absque auctoritate mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 addit *et habet et*. Codd. T W *habens dicitur haberi*, plures codd. ut A C G L R S U Y corrupte *habens dicitur*, alii tamen codd. cum edd. 1, 2, 3 exhibent lectionem nostram.
[5] Ex plurimis mss. et d. 1 substituimus *quia* pro ambiguo *quod*.
[6] Multi codd. ut A B C D F G I L O R S T U W etc. omittunt ultima verba *quia ad idem* usque *transfertur*.

[1] James 1:17.
[2] The Vatican edition, disagreeing with the manuscripts and edition 1, omits *must be* [est]
[3] For this is taken from the first proposition of the objection.
[4] The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and edition 1, has *donation* [donatione] in place of *giving* [datione], and a little below this, contrary to the more ancient codices and edition 1, omits *two* [duo], then after *the one having* [habens] without the authority of the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, it adds *both has and* [et habet et]. Codices T and W have *the one having is said to be had* [habens dicitur haberi], very many codices, such as A C G L R S U Y, with a corrupted reading have *the one having is meant* [habens dicitur], however the other codices, together with editions 1, 2, and 3, exhibit our reading.
[5] From very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *because* [quia] for the ambiguous *that/because* [quod].
[6] Many codices, such as A B C D F G I L O R S T U W etc., omit the last words beginning at *because they tend to the same* [quia ad idem tendunt].

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

COMMENTARIUS IN

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION

DISTINCTIONEM XIV.
ARTICULUS II.

Quaestio II.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 250-253.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

QUAESTIO II.

Utrum Spiritus sanctus detur ab aliquo viro sancto.

Secundo quaeritur, utrum Spiritus sanctus detur ab aliquo viro sancto. Et quod sic, probatur hoc modo:
Spiritum sanctum dari non est aliud quam gratiam gratum facientem dari; sed ostenditur, quod gratiam gratum facientem ab homine dari sive infundi est *possibile* et *conveniens* et *verum*.

1. Et quod sit *possibile*, videtur a minori: quia maioris virtutis est producere formam substantialem quam accidentalem; sed[7] gratia est forma accidentalis: cum ergo creatura habeat virtutem producendi formam substantialem, multo fortius videtur de gratia, quae est forma accidentalis.

2. Item, hoc ipsum videtur posse ostendi[8] *a simili*: quia gratia est lumen spirituale; sed ita videmus in lumine corporali, quod aliquid est luminis *dativum*, aliquid *receptivum*, aliquid *dativum* et *receptivum*: ergo si lumen spirituale est aeque potens, pari ratione videtur de ipso. Sed dativum, cum sit Deus, non potest esse receptivum, quia nihil recipit ab aliquo: ergo hoc est reperiri in creatura, quod *recipiat* lumen spirituale, quod est gratia, et *det* ipsum; et sic etc.[9]

3. Item, duo sunt, quae faciunt creaturam habere posse producendi sibi simile, scilicet *corrupt- / -ibilitas* . . .

---

[7] Vat. cum cod. cc minus distincte et contra ceteros codd. cum ed. 1 *et* pro *sed*.
[8] Pauci scripti ut T aa addunt *ratione*.
[9] Vat. et cod. cc, aliis tamen codd. cum ed. 1 refragantibus, perperam *de aliis* loco *etc*.

XIV
ARTICLE II

Question 2

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 250-253.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

QUESTION 2

Whether the Holy Spirit is given by any holy man.

Second there is asked, whether the Holy Spirit is given by any holy man [viro]. And that (this is) so, is proven in this manner:
To give the Holy Spirit is nothing other [non aliud] than to give the grace that makes one pleasing (to God); but it is shown, that to give or infuse the grace which makes one pleasing is *possible* and *fitting* and *true*.

1. That that it is *possible*, seems a minori: because it belongs to a greater virtue to produce a substantial form than an accidental one; but[7] grace is an accidental form: therefore since a creature has the virtue of producing a substantial form, much more strongly does it seem concerning grace, which is an accidental form.

2. Likewise, this very (thing) seems to be shown[8] a simili: because grace is a spiritual light; but we see in a corporal light thus, because something is *donative* [dativum], something *receptive*, something *donative* and *receptive*: therefore if a spiritual light is equally potent, for an equal reason it seems concerning this. But the donative, since He is God, cannot be receptive, because He receives nothing from anyone: therefore this is to be found in the creature, because he *receives* the spiritual light, which is grace, and *gives* it; and thus etc..[9]

3. Likewise, there are two, which make a creature have the ability [posse] to produce a similar to itself, namely *corrupt- / -ibility* . . .

---

[7] The Vatican edition together with codex cc less distinctly, and contrary to all the other codices together with edition 1, has *and* [et] for *but* [sed].
[8] A few texts, such as T and aa, have *by a similar reckoning* [ratione a simili].
[9] The Vatican edition and codex cc, yet with the

other codices together with edition 1 disagreeing, faultily has *concerning the others* [de aliis] for *etc.* [etc.].

---

corrupt- / -ibilitas, ob quam indiget conservari in alio, et *perfectio* in natura, ob quam potest in actum perfectum, qui est producere sibi similem.[1] « Perfectum enim dicitur unumquodque, cum potest generare tale, quale ipsum est ».[2] Si ergo gratia est forma, quae citissime corrumpitur, et forma magnae perfectionis: ergo debet habere virtutem producendi sibi similem; sed non in subiecto in quo est: ergo in alio.

corrupt- / -ibility, on account of which it needs to be conserved in another, and *perfection* in nature, on account of which it can be in perfect act, which is to produce a similar to itself.[1] « For the "perfect" is said (to be) each thing, when it can generate such as it itself is ».[2] If, therefore, grace is a form, which is most swiftly corrupted, and a form of great perfection: therefore it ought to have the virtue to produce a similar to itself; but not in the subject in which it is: therefore in another.

4. Item, quod potest perfecte expellere contrarium potest perfect aggenerare[3] habitum contarium, quia contrarium non expellitur perfecte nisi per contrarium; sed gratia potest perfecte expellere culpam: ergo gratia in homine potest ex se generare gratiam; sed non in habente, ergo in alio.

4. Likewise, what can perfectly expel a contrary can perfectly engender [aggenerare][3] the contrary habit, because a contrary is not perfectly expelled except through a contrary; but grace can perfectly expel fault: therefore grace in man can of itself generate grace; but not in the one having, therefore in another.

5. Ostenditur etiam,[4] quod sit *congruum*, quod gratia procedat ab uno homine in alium. Et sic ostenditur: ratio superbiendi fuit ratio amittendi gratiam, ergo ab oppositis, humiliatio est ratio recuperandi;[5] sed si gratia datur ab homine, plus humiliatur homo, quam si tantum a Deo; quia si datur ab homine, humiliatur homo sub Deo et sub homine, non autem, si a solo Deo datur, humiliatur sub utroque: ergo videtur, quod iste modus magis congruat.[6]

5. It is also[4] shown, that it is *congruous*, that grace proceeds from one man into another. And it is shown in this manner: a reason for being proud was the reason for loosing grace, therefore <u>ab oppositis</u>, a humiliation is the reason for recuperating (it);[5] but if grace is given by a man, man is humiliated more, than if (it is given) only by God; because if it is given by a man, a man is humiliated under God and under a man, but not, if it is given by God alone, is he humiliated under each: therefore it seems, that this manner is more congruent.[6]

6. Item, si in[7] actu *iustitiae*, qui est punitio, subiicitur anima peccatrix creaturae corporali, ut ordinetur in universo: ergo in actu *misericordiae* debet subiici alicui creaturae, ut reordinatur: ergo sicut ab aliqua creatura recipit poenam, ita videtur congruum, quod recipiat et gratiam.

6. Likewise, if in[7] an act of *justice*, which is a punishment, a sinful soul [anima peccatrix] is subjected to a corporal creature, so that it be ordered in each and every way [in universo]: therefore in an act of *mercy* it ought to be subjected to some creature, so that it be reordered: therefore just as it receives a punishment from some creature, so it seems congruous, that it also receive grace.

7. Item, perfectum agens non tantum dat suscipienti formam, sed etiam dat potentiam consimilem;[8] et hoc est in manifestationem suae potentiae: ergo si Deus est agens nobilissimum et qui maxime

7. Likewise, a perfect agent not only gives form to the recipient [suscipienti], but also gives a completely similar power;[8] and this is unto the manifestation of its own power: therefore if God is the most noble agent and

debet laudari in sua actione, congruum est, ut non tantum det formam gratiae, sed etiam potentiam dandi.

the One who most of all ought to be praised in His action, it is congruent, that not only He give form to grace, but also the power of giving (it).

8. Item, sicut a Deo est *esse*, ita et *bene esse*; sed in nullo derogatur Deo, cum dat potentiam creaturae dandi *esse*: ergo in nullo derogatur, cum dat potentiam dandi *bene esse*, ergo et esse gratuitum.

8. Likewise, just as from God there is '*being*' [esse], so also '*well being*' [bene esse]; but in nothing is there a derogation [derogatur] from God, when He gives the power to a creature of giving '*being*': therefore in nothing is there a derogation, when He gives the power of giving '*well being*', therefore also 'gratuitous being' [esse gratuitum].

9. Ostenditur autem quod sit *verum*, quia Ioannis vigesimo[9] dixit Dominus: *Accipite Spiritum sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis* etc.

9. Moreover it is shown that it is *true*, because in the twentieth (chapter of the Gospel of St.) John,[9] the Lord said: *Accept the Holy Spirit; whose sins you will have forgiven, are forgiven them* etc..

10. Item, in Actibus[10] dicitur, quod per impositionem manuum Apostolorum dabatur Spiritus sanctus, non per impositionem manuum aliorum, ut dicit Glossa de Philippo discipulo, Actuum octavo: ergo aliqua virtus erat in Apostolis, quae non erat in aliis; sed per illam dabatur Spiritus sanctus: ergo ab homine dabatur Spiritus sanctus.

10. Likewise, in Acts[10] it is said, that through the imposition of the hands of the Apostles the Holy Spirit was given, not through the imposition of the hands of others, as the Gloss says concerning the disciple Philip, in the eighth (chapter) of Acts: therefore there was some virtue in the Apostles, which was not in the others; but through that the Holy Spirit was given: therefore the Holy Spirit was given by a man [ab homine].

E converso ostenditur, quod donum Spiritus sancti dari ab homine sit *falsum*, sit *incongruum*, sit etiam *impossibile*.

And on the other hand, it is shown that the gift of the Holy Spirit is given by a man is *false*, is *incongruous*, is even *impossible*.

1. Quod sit *falsum*, videtur per Augustinum, decimo quinto de Trinitate:[11] « Non aliquis discipulorum dabat Spiritum sanctum, sed orabant, ut veniret in hominem ».

1. That it is *false*, seems through (St.) Augustine, in the fifteenth (book) On the Trinity:[11] « None of the disciples gave the Holy Spirit, but (rather) they prayed, that He might come upon a man ».

2. Item, quicumque dat vel donat aliquid, habet posse[12] activum super illud; sed super donum Spiritus sancti nullus homo habet posse: ergo etc.

2. Likewise, whosoever gives and/or donates anything, has an active power [posse][12] over it; but no man has power [posse] over the gift of the Holy Spirit: ergo etc..

3. Item, quod sit *inconveniens*, videtur, quia si anima ab alio quam a Deo gratificatur, alius quam Deus cadit medium inter animam et Deum. Sed quandocumque aliquid cadit medium[13] inter animam et Deum, anima hominis est perversa: ergo secundum hoc, dum daretur animae gratia, perverteretur.

3. Likewise, that it is *unfitting*, seems, because if a soul is gratified by something other than God [ab alio quam Deo], the 'something other than God' falls as a medium between the soul and God. But whensoever anything falls as a medium[13] between the soul and God, the soul of the man has been perverted: therefore according to this, while grace would be given to the soul, it would be perverted.

4. Item, gratia potest super liberum arbitrium, ergo si posset homo dare gratiam, homo haberet posse super alterius

4. Likewise, grace is powerful [potest] over free will, therefore if a man could give grace, a man would have a power [posse]

arbitrium; sed arbitrium, quod est alii subiectum, non est liberum: ergo talis donatio tolleret[14] libertatem.

over the judgment [arbitrium] of another; but a judgment, which is subject to another, is not free: therefore such a donation would take away[14] liberty.

5. Item, maxima est gloria Deo[15] de impii iustificatione, sed maxima gloria Dei non debet alii communicari: ergo si communicatur, divinae gloriae derogatur, sed si alius quam Deus dat gratiam, alius quam Deus iustificat: ergo talis donatio minuit Dei gloriam.

5. Likewise, the greatest glory for God[15] concerns the justification of the impious, but the greatest glory of God ought not to be communicated to another: therefore if it is communicated, there is a derogation of the divine glory, but if 'something other than God' gives grace, 'something other than God' justifies: therefore such a donation lessens the glory of God.

6. Item, iustum est in eo sperare, qui potest dare meritum salutis; sed si homo posset dare gratiam, posset dare meritum salutis: ergo iustum esset . . .

6. Likewise, it is just to hope in the one, who can give the merit of salvation; but if man could give grace, he could give the merit of salvation: therefore it would be just

---

[1] Fide mss. et 1 hic et circa finem argumenti loco *simile* substituimus *similem*, quod et plures codd. cum ed. 1 circa principium argumenti exhibent. — De duplici ratione, ob quam creaturis convenit potentia producendi sibi simile, vide supra d. 7. q. 2. in corp.
[2] Aristot., II. de Anima, text. 34. (c. 4) et IV. Meteor. text. 19. (c. 3). Cfr. supra d. 9. q. 1. — In quo textu, postulantibus antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1, posuimus *cum* loco *quod*. Mox Vat. cum codd. cc, aliis tamen codd. et ed. 1 obnitentibus, minus bene *autem* pro *ergo*. Paulo infra cod. O *maxime* loco *magnae*.
[3] Sequimur codd. A C H I R S T U etc. cum ed. 1 ponendo *aggenerare* logo *generare*, quod Vat. habet.
[4] Vat. absque auctoritate mss. et ed. 1 *autem*.
[5] Unus alterque codex ut I V repetit hic *gratiam*. Mox plures codd. ut A I S T W Y etc. incongrue *ergo* pro *sed*.
[6] Fide plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *iste* loco *ille*, et *congruat* pro *conveniat*.
[7] Vat. contra mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 *cum*, sed minus bene. In fine argumenti ope mss. et ed. 1 posuimus *ita* et *quod* loco *sic* et *ut*.
[8] Avveroes, Comment. in VIII. Phys. text. 32: Generans enim est illud quod dat corpori simplici generato formam suam et omnia accidentia contigentia formae. — In fine argumenti cod. B addit *gratiam*.
[9] Vers. 22, 23.
[10] Cap. 8, 17. — Verba glossae ordinariae mox citatae sunt: Philippus, qui Samariae evangelizabat, unus de septem (diaconis) fuit. Si enim Apostolus esset, manus imponere posset, ut Spiritum acciperent, quod solis episcopis licet.
[11] Cap. 26. n. 46. Vide in lit. Magistri, c. 3.
[12] Auctoritate plurimorum mss. et ed. 1 expunximus hic minus apte additum *aliquod*; mox bis substituimus *super* loco *supra*.
[13] In Vat. et cod. cc perperam deest *medium*, quod in aliis mss. et ed. 1 habetur. Paulo infra unus alterque codex ut T ee *cum* pro *dum*.
[14] Vat. contra vetustiores codd. et ed. 1 *tollit*, deinde contra omnes codd. et ed. 1 addit *arbitrii*.

---

[1] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, here and near the end of the argument, we have substituted the feminine singular [similem] for the neuter singular for *similar* [simile], which even very many of the codices together with edition 1 exhibit near the beginning of the argument. — On the twofold reason, on account of which the power of producing a similar to itself befits creatures, see above d. 7, q. 2, in the body (of the response).
[2] Aristotle, On the Soul, Bk. II, text 34 (ch. 4), and Meteorology, Bk. IV, text 19 (ch. 3). Cf. above d. 9, q. 1. — In which text, having examined the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have put *when* [cum] place of *which* [quod]. Then the Vatican edition together with the codex cc, yet with the other codices and edition striving against it, has less well *on the other hand* [autem] for *therefore* [ergo]. A little below this codex X has *mostly of* [maxime] in place of *of great* [magnae].
[3] We follow codices A C H I R S T U etc. together with edition 1 by putting *engender* [aggenerare] in place of the *generate* [generare], which the Vatican edition has *moreover*.
[4] The Vatican edition, without the authority of the manuscripts and edition 1, has *moreover* [autem].
[5] One or the other codex, such as I and V, repeats here *grace* [gratiam].
[6] Trusting very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *this* [iste] for *that* [ille], and *is congruent* [congruat] for *is fitting* [conveniat].
[7] The Vatican edition, contrary to the manuscripts and editions 1, 2, and 3, has *with* [cum], but less well. At the end of the argument, with the help of the manuscripts and edition 1, we have put *so* [ita] and *that* [quod] in place of *in this manner* [sic] and *that* [ut].
[8] Averroës, Commentary on Aristotle's Physics, Bk VIII, text 32: For the one generating is that which gives to a simple generated body its own form and all its contingent accidents. — At the end of the argument, codex B adds *grace* [gratiam].
[9] Jn. 20:22-23
[10] Acts 8:17. — The words of the Glossa ordinaria

[15] Ita antiquiores codd. cum ed. 1, dum Vat. *Dei*, quod edd. 2, 3 omittunt.

are then cited: Philip, who evangelized Samaria, was one of the seven (deacons). For if he were an Apostle, he could impose hands, so that they might receive the Spirit, which is licit to Bishops alone.

[11] Chapter 26, n. 46. See the text of Master (Peter), here in ch. 3.

[12] On the authority of very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged there the less aptly added *something* [aliquod]; then we have twice substituted *over* [super] for *above* [supra].

[13] In the Vatican edition and codex cc there is faultily lacking *medium* [medium], which is had in the other manuscripts and edition 1. A little below this one or the other codex, such as T and ee, have *when* [cum] for *while* [dum].

[14] The Vatican edition, contrary to the older codices and edition 1, has *takes away* [tollit], and then contrary to all the codices and edition 1, it adds (in English at the end) *of judgment* [arbitrii].

[15] Thus the more ancient codices, together with edition 1, while the Vatican edition has an *of God*, which editions 2 and 3 omit.

---

sperare in homine; sed homo est vanitas:[1] ergo donatio talis daret fiduciam vanitatis.

to hope in a man; but man is vanity:[1] therefore such a donation would give trust to vanity [fiduciam vanitatis].

Ex his quatuor mediis patet, quod donatio Spiritus sancti ab homine tollit *ordinem* ipsius animae,[2] tollit *libertatem*, minuit *gloriam* Dei et inducit in *vanam confidentiam*, quae omnia sunt inconvenientia.

From these four means it is clear, that the donation of the Holy Spirit by a man takes away the *order* of the soul itself,[2] takes away *liberty*, lessens the *glory* of God and leads one into *vain confidence*, all of which are (things) unfitting.

7. Ostenditur etiam, quod *impossibile* sit, dari talem potentiam creaturae: quia, sicut dicit Augustinus,[3] « maius est de impio facere pium quam creare caelum et terram ». Sed potentia creandi non potuit a creatura recipi: ergo nec potentia dandi gratiam.

7. It is also shown, that it is *impossible*, that such a power be given to a creature: because, just as (St.) Augustine says,[3] « it is greater to make one pious from impious than to create Heaven and Earth ». But the power of creating cannot be received by a creature: therefore neither the power of giving grace.

8. Item, productio gratiae per praesentiam agentis ab anima suscipitur; sed solus Deus potest animae illabi: ergo solus Deus potest gratiam infundere in animam.

8. Likewise, the production of grace is taken up [suscipitur] by the soul through the presence of the agent; but God alone can glide into [illabi] the soul: therefore God alone can infuse grace into the soul.

9. Item, gratia est forma simplex et deiformis et spiritualis, non habens ortum a principiis subiecti: ergo cum anima rationalis ratione deiformitatis et spiritualitatis non possit[4] esse nisi a Deo, patet quod nec gratia, quae aeque spiritualis, immo spiritualior est ipsa anima.

9. Likewise, grace is a simple form, both deiform and spiritual, not having (its) rise from the principles of the subject: therefore since a rational soul by reason of (its) deiformity and spirituality cannot[4] be except from God, it is clear that neither (can) grace, which is equally spiritual, nay more spiritual than the soul itself.

10. Item, gratia immediate unit Deo: ergo non potest esse a Deo nisi immediate, ergo

10. Likewise, grace unites (one) immediately to God: therefore it cannot be

nullo cooperante: ergo creatura non potest producere gratiam.

CONCLUSIO.

Spiritus sanctus non potest dari ab homine sicut a principio effective, potest tamen dari ab ipso sicut a praeparante vel impetrante.

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod, sicut istae ultimae rationes ostendunt, gratiam sive Spiritum sanctum dari ab homine sicut a principio *effectivo* sive productivo, omnino est *falsum* et *impossibile*.

Tamen propter intelligentiam obiectorum in contrarium est notandum, quod gratiam dari ab aliquo est tripliciter: vel sicut a *praeparante*, sive administrante[5] Sacramenta sive annuntiante salutaria documenta; vel sicut ab *impetrante*, sive per orationem sive per bona opera; vel sicut a *producente*. Primo modo datur gratia a bonis et a malis; secundo modo tantum a bonis; tertio modo tantum a Deo.

Et per hoc manifesta est responsio ad duo ultima,[6] quae probant, Spiritum sanctum dari, quia ibi datio nihil aliud est quam praeparatio.

1. Ad illud ergo quod obiicitur *primo*, quod agens creatum possit in formam substantialem; dico, quod non potest in omnem substantialem, ut puta in eam quae est deiformis, sicut est anima rationalis. Et quia gratia est deiformis,[7] ideo non potest ab agente tali produci. Si autem de aliis formis naturalibus arguat, non est *locus a minori*.

2. Ad illud quod obiicitur de lumine corporali, dicendum, quod non est simile. Lumen enim corporale diffunditur per medium deferens, et per idem medium potest iterum aggenerari[8] quod defertur; gratia autem non est per delationem, sed per illapsum agentis et omnimodam indistantiam.

3. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod creatura corruptibilis debet habere potentiam

but from God immediately, therefore with no one cooperating: therefore a creature cannot produce grace.

CONCLUSION

The Holy Spirit cannot be given by a man as by an effective principle, yet He can be given by him as by one preparing and/or obtaining by request.

I respond: It must be said, that, just as those last reasons show, that grace or the Holy Spirit is given by a man as by an *effective* or productive principle, is entirely *false* and *impossible*.

However for the sake of an understanding of the objections to the contrary it must be noted, that it is in a threefold manner that grace is given by anyone: either as by *one preparing*, or by one administering[5] the Sacraments or by one announcing the admonitions of salvation [salutaria documenta]; and/or as by *one obtaining by request*, either through praying or through good works; and/or as by *one producing*. In the first manner grace is given by the good and by the bad; in the second manner only by the good; in the third manner only by God.

And through this there is manifest the response to the last two,[6] which prove, that the Holy Spirit is given, because there the giving is nothing other than a preparation.

1. To that, therefore, which is objected *first*, that a created agent is potent upon a substantial form; I say, that it is not potent upon every substantial, as for example upon that, which is deiform, as is the rational soul. And because grace is deiform,[7] for that reason it cannot be produced by such an agent. But if one argues of other natural forms, the argument is not a minori.

2. To that which is objected concerning corporal light, it must be said, that it is not similar. For corporal light is diffused through a down-bearing [deferens] medium, and through the same medium there can again be engendered[8] what is borne down; but grace is not through a 'being born down' [delationem], but through the gliding-in of the agent and an omnimodal indistance.

3. To that which is objected, that a corruptible creature ought to have a power

generandi; dicendum, quod verum est de illa quae corruptibilis est *de se*; sed gratia de se nunquam corrumpitur vel senescit.

Vel dic, quod illa non est tota causa, maxime in his quae non dicunt substantiam completam, sed magis dispositionem.

4. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod gratia potest expellere culpa: dicendum, quod expellere culpam est dupliciter: vel *effective*, vel *formaliter*. Quod potest expellere *effective*, potest efficere gratiam: sed non oportet, quod illud quod *formaliter*, quia illud se ipso expellit. Quoniam igitur gratia expellit formaliter et se ispa, ideo non sequitur, quod possit generare aliam gratiam.

5. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod in iustificatione debet peccator humiliari; dicendum, quod verum est, quia humiliari debet et sub homine et etiam sub visibilibus signis; tamen aliter quam sub Deo, quia alius honor debetur Deo quam homini; et ideo, quia sub Deo humiliatur ut sub principio salutis et a quo salvatur, non[9] debet sub creatura humiliari, ut a qua salus detur ei, sed ut a qua salus administratur.

6. Et sic patet etiam sequens de humiliatione in poena. Non enim est simile de humiliatione illa, quia ibi anima perversa, *manens* in sua perversitate, ratione illius subiicitur inferiori per naturam, *vel* quia habet reliquias perversitatis; sed in gratiae donatione anima pervera a perversitate mutatur et ad Deum immediate ordinatur.

of generating; it must be said, that it is true of that which is corruptible *from itself* [de se]; but grace from itself is never corrupted nor grows old.

And/or say, that that is not the whole cause, mostly in those which are not said (to be) a complete substance, but rather a disposition.

4. To that which is objected, that grace can expel fault: it must be said, that it is in a twofold manner that one expels fault: *effectively*, and/or *formally*. What can expel *effectively*, can effect grace: but it is not necessary [oportet], that (it be) that which *formally* (does such), because it expels by its very self. Therefore since grace expels formally and by its very self, for that reason it does not follow, that it could generate another grace.

5. To that which is objected, that in justification the sinner ought to be humiliated; it must be said, that it is true, because he ought to be humiliated both beneath man and also beneath visible signs; however otherwise than under God, because another honor is owed to God than to man; and for that reason, because he is humiliated beneath God as beneath the Principle of salvation and (Him) by whom he is saved, he ought not[9] be humiliated beneath a creature, as (beneath one) by which salvation is given him, but (rather) as (beneath one) by which salvation is administered.

6. And thus is clear even the following (objection) concerning humiliation in punishment. For it is not similar concerning that humiliation, because there the perverse soul, *remaining* in its perversity, by reason of that is subjected to an inferior through nature, *and/or* because it has the relics of perversity; but in the donation of grace the perverse soul is changed from perversity and ordered immediately to God.

---

[1] Psalm. 38, 6: Verumtamen universa vanitas omnis homo vivens. — Mox cod. aa cum ed. 1 *datio* pro *donatio*.
[2] Vat., omisso *ipsius*, hic addit *ad Deum* et post *tollit* adiungit *arbitrii*, sed obstant codd. cum ed. 1. — In principio huius propositionis post *his* cod. et ed. 1 satis bene addunt *igitur*.
[3] Expositio in Evang. Ioan. tract. 72. n. 3.
[4] Multi codd. cum tribus primis edd. *post*.
[5] Ex plurimis mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *administrante* pro *ministrante*, et post *Sacramenta*

[1] Ps. 38:6: Nevertheless, each and every vanity, every man living. — Then codex aa together with edition 1 has *giving* [datio] for *donation* [donatio].
[2] The Vatican edition, having omitted *itself* [ipius], here adds *to God* [ad Deum], and after *takes away* [tollit] adds *judgment's* [arbitrii], but with the codices and edition 1 opposed. — At the beginning of this proposition after *these* [his] codex M and edition 1 add, sufficiently well, *therefore* [igitur].
[3] Exposition on the Gospel of St. John, tract 72, n. 3.
[4] Many codices together with three first editions

particulam *sive* pro ambiguo *seu sicut ab*; deinde post *impetrante* adiecimus non bene omissum *sive*. Mox codd. aa bb post *producente* addunt *et infudente*.
[6] Vat. praeter fidem vetustiorum mss. et edd. 1, 2, 3 addit *obiecta*.
[7] Vat. cum paucis codd. hic superflue repetit *sicut est anima rationalis*. Mox ex codd. cum sex primis edd. posuimus *arguat* loco *arguatur*.
[8] Ex plurimis codd. substituimus *aggenerari* pro *generari*, loco cuius codd. L O habent *aliud generari* et ed. 1 *aggregari*.
[9] Fide mss. et ed. 1 expunximus *sic*, quod Vat. particulae *non* praefigit.

have *after* [post].
[5] From very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *one administering* [administrante] for *one ministering* [ministrante], and after *the Sacraments* [Sacramenta] the particle *or* [sive] for the ambiguous *or as by* [seu sicut ab]; then after *by one obtaining by request* [impetrante] we have inserted the not well omitted *either* [sive]. Then codices aa and bb after *one producing* [producente] add *and one infusing* [et infundente].
[6] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the older manuscripts and in editions 1, 2, and 3, adds *objections* [obiecta].
[7] The Vatican edition together with a few codices here superfluously repeats *as is a rational soul* [sicut est anima rationalis].
[8] From very many codices we have substituted *be engendered* [aggenerari] for *be generated* [generari], in place of which codices L and O have "through the same medium *another* can *be generated*" [aliud generari], and edition 1 *be aggregated* [aggregari].
[9] Trusting the manuscripts and edition 1, we have expunged the *in this manner* [sic], which the Vatican edition has prefixed to *not* [non].

---

p. 253

7. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod agens perfectum dat potentiam agendi simile; dicendum, quod verum est, si patiens congruenter[1] posset suscipere; sed, sicut ostensum est, ex parte hominis non est possibile, ut talis potentia ab eo recipiatur, propter talis formae nobilitatem, quae non potest esse nisi a nobilissimo agente.

7. To that which is objected, that a perfect agent gives a similar power of acting; it must be said, that it is true, if the patient could take it up in a congruent manner;[1] but, just as has been shown, on the part of a man it is not possible, that such a power be received by him, on account of the nobility of such a form, which cannot be except by a most noble agent.

8. Ad illud quod obiicitur, quod dare potentiam ad[2] esse non derogat Deo; dicendum, quod *ordo* est in essentiis; quia aliquae creaturae sunt ita nobiles, quod non decet eas nisi a nobilissimo agente produci, ut sunt illae quae sunt ad imaginem.[3] Quoniam igitur gratia est de nobilissimis, patet, quod non potest produci ab homine, sicut nec esse animae.

8. To that which is objected, that to give the power regarding[2] 'being' does not derogate from God; it must be said, that there is an *order* among essences; because some creatures are so noble, that it is not decent that they be produced except by a most noble agent, as are those which are according to the Image (of God).[3] Therefore, since grace concerns (things) most noble, it is clear, that it cannot be produced by a man, just as neither (can) the 'being' of a soul.

9. 10. Quae ultimo obiiciuntur soluta sunt supra per distinctionem dationis secundum differentiam[4] trimembrem.

9. 10. Those which last are objected have been solved above through the distinction of 'giving', according to the tri-member difference.[4]

SCHOLION.

I. Haec quaestio non parum luminis affert ad solvendas difficultates, quae contra doctrinam catholicam de sacerdotio visibili ab adversariis Ecclesiae proferuntur. —

SCHOLIUM

I. This question brings not a little light to bear for the solving of the difficulties, which are proffered against the Catholic doctrine concerning the visible priesthood by the

Vocabulum *deiformis* (in solut. ad 1.) duplici sensu sumitur, scil. improprie de ea similitudine, quae naturaliter inest *imagini* Dei, et proprie de supernaturali similitudine, quae est per gratiam quaeque nos immediate Deo coniungit. Cfr. supra d. 3. p. I. q. 2. ad ult.; et II. Sent. d. 16. a. 2. q. 3.

adversaries of the Church. — The word "*deiform*" [deiformis] (in the solution to n. 1) is taken in a twofold sense, namely, improperly of that similitude, which is naturally in *the image* of God, and properly of the supernatural similitude, which is through the grace of anything which immediately conjoins us to God. Cf. above d. 3, p. I, q. 2, in reply to the last objection, and Book II, d. 16, a. 2, q. 3.

II. Alex. Hal., S. p. I. q. 72. m. 4. — S. Thom., hic q. 3. — B. Albert., hic a. 16. — Petr. a Tar., hic q. 1. a. 7. — Richard. a Med., hic a. 2. q. 3. — Aegid. R., hic 3. princ. q. unic. — Durand., hic q. 4. — Dionys. Carth., hic q. 2. quaestiunc. 1.

II. Alexander of Hales, Summa., p. I, q. 72, m. 4. — St. Thomas, here in q. 3. — Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 16. — (Bl.) Peter of Tarentaise, here in q. 1, a. 7. — Richard of Middleton, here in a. 2, q. 3. — Giles the Roman., here in 3rd. princ., q. sole. — Durandus, here in q. 4. — (Bl.) Dionysius the Carthusian, here in q. 2., quaestiunc. 1.

---

[1] Vat. cum cod. cc *convenienter*, alii codd. vero cum ed. 1 *congruenter*.
[2] Vat. praeter fidem mss. et ed. 1 addit *bene*. Mox plurimi codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt *Deo*.
[3] Supple cum cod. V: *Dei*.
[4] Lectionem Vat. et cod. cc *naturam* loco *differentiam* emendavimus ope ceterorum mss. et ed. 1.

[1] The Vatican edition, together with codex cc, has *in a fitting manner* [convenienter], but the other codices together with edition 1, have *in a congruent manner* [congruenter].
[2] The Vatican edition, not trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1, adds *well* [bene]. Then very many codices together with edition 1 omit *from God* [Deo].
[3] Supply with codex V: *of God*.
[4] The reading of the Vatican edition and codex cc, *nature* [naturam] in place of *difference* [differentiam], we have emended with the help of all the other manuscripts and edition 1.

S. Bonaventurae Bagnoregis
S. R. E. Episc. Card. Albae
atque Doctor Ecclesiae Universalis

Commentaria in Quatuor Libros Sententiarum

Magistri Petri Lombardi, Episc. Parisiensis

PRIMI LIBRI

St. Bonaventure of Bagnoregio
Cardinal Bishop of Alba
& Doctor of the Church

Commentaries on the Four Books of Sentences

of Master Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Paris

BOOK ONE

COMMENTARIUS IN DISTINCTIONEM XIV.
DUBIA CIRCA LITTERAM MAGISTRI.

Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol 1, pp. 253-255.
Cum Notitiis Originalibus

Dub. I.

In parte ista sunt dubitationes circa litteram, et primo de *situ* huius partis, quia non videtur, quod hic deberet agere de processione temporali, quia in hac parte agit de his quae aeternaliter Deo conveniunt. *Praeterea*, cum generatio Filii aeterna et temporalis in alio et alio libro determinetur, quia aeterna in primo, sed temporalis in tertio, quare non similiter facit de processione Spiritus sancti?

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod quia[5] processio temporalis et aeterna ab eodem principio sunt, sicut dicit Magister,[6] et iterum est ibi quodam modo modus procedendi conformis, ideo una facit ad declarationem alterius; et ideo incidenter ponitur hic tractatus de processione temporali ad manifestationem[7] processionis aeternae. Sed non sic est de generatione Filii temporali, quia non est ab eodem principio, immo a Matre tantum, et respicit duas naturas, scilicet divinam et humanam. Ideo debuit de ea determinari post divinam, de qua agitur in primo, et post humanam naturam, de qua in secundo.

Dub. II.

Item quaeritur de ratione processionis temporalis, de qua dicit Magister, quod *a Patre et Filio procedit Spiritus sanctus, cum ad sanctificandam creaturam procedit*. Videtur enim dicere falsum, quia processio temporalis est eius missio; sed Spiritus

COMMENTARY ON DISTINCTION XIV
DOUBTS ON THE TEXT OF MASTER PETER

Latin text taken from **Opera Omnia S. Bonaventurae**,
Ad Claras Aquas, 1882, Vol. 1, pp. 253-255.
Notes by the Quaracchi Editors.

Doubt I

In this part are the doubts about the text (of Master Peter), and first concerning the *positioning* [situ] of this part, because it does not seem, that one ought to here deal with the temporal procession (of the Holy Spirit), because in this part he deals with those which befit God eternally. *Besides*, since the eternal and temporal generation of the Son is determined in one and the other book, because the eternal in the First, but the temporal in the Third, for what reason does he not similarly do (this) concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit?

I respond: It must be said, that because[5] the temporal and the eternal procession are from the same principle, just as Master (Peter) says,[6] and again (because) there is There in a certain manner a conform manner of proceeding, for that reason one works for the declaration of the other; and for that reason here there is posited in passing a treatment on the temporal procession for the manifestation[7] of the eternal procession. But not so does it concern the temporal generation of the Son, because it is not from the same principle, nay (it is) only from (His) Mother, and it looks back to two natures, namely the Divine and the human. For that reason there ought to have been a determination of it after the Divine (Nature), of which it deals in the First (Book), and after human nature, of which (it deals) in the Second.

Doubt II

Likewise is asked of the temporal procession, of which Master (Peter) says, that *the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, when He proceeds to sanctify a creature*. For it seems false to say, that the temporal procession is His

sanctus est missus in columba et in liinguis igneis, quas non sanctificavit. *Si tu dicas*, quod non est missus *ad linguas*, sed *in linguis* missus *ad Apostolos*, quos sanctificavit; *contra*: missus est in columba super Christum, nec sanctificavit columbam nec Christum.

being-sent [missio]; but the Holy Spirit has been sent in (the form of) a dove and in tongues of fire, which He did not sanctify. *If you say*, that He was not sent *for tongues*, but (was) sent *in tongues to the Apostles*, whom He did sanctify; *on the contrary*: He was sent in (the form of) a dove upon Christ, and He neither sanctified the dove nor Christ.

Respondeo: Potest ad hoc dici, quod Magister non *generaliter* definit hic processionem temporalem, sed *specialiter*, prout est idem quod missio invisibilis, in qua datur Spiritus sanctus et sanctificatur creatura. Vel potest dici, quod *generaliter* accipit *sanctificationem*. Tripliciter enim accipitur sanctificare: *uno* modo, secundum quod est de non sancto sanctum facere; *secundo* modo, iam sanctum in sanctitate confirmare; *tertio* modo, iam sanctum et confirmatum manifestare. Et secundum aliquem trium[8] istorum modorum reperitur sanctificatio in omni Spiritus sancti missione ratione *termini ad quem*; et sic accipit Magister.[9]

I respond: It can be said to this, that Master (Peter) does not define here the temporal procession *in a general manner*, but (rather) *in a special one*; insofar as it is the same (thing) which the invisible mission (is), in which the Holy Spirit is given and the creature sanctified. And/or it can be said, that he accepts *sanctification in a general manner*. For “to sanctify” is accepted in a threefold manner: in *one* manner, according to which it is that one makes holy from what is not holy; in a *second* manner, (according to which it is) that one confirms (something) holy in holiness; in a *third* manner, (according to which it is) that one manifests (something) already holy and confirmed. And according to any of these three[8] manners sanctification is found in every sending [missione] of the Holy Spirit by reason of *the terminus to which*, and in this manner does Master (Peter) accept it.[9]

Dub. III.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit Magister de . . .

Doubt III

Likewise is asked of this which Master (Peter) says of . . .

---

[5] In Vat. et cod. cc male deest *quia*, quod tamen exstat in aliis codd. et ed. 1.
[6] Hic, c. 1. — Mox ex antiquioribus mss. et ed. 1 substituimus *procedendi* pro minus apto *producendi*, deinde post *conformis* delevimus particulam *et*, ac paulo infra loco *incidentaliter* posuimus *incidenter*.
[7] Cod. dd *declarationem*.
[8] Fide mss. et ed. 1 supplevimus *trium*.
[9] Cod. dd solutionem huius dubii ita exhibet: *Respondeo, dicendum, quod sanctificare est tripliciter intelligere: primo modo est de non sancto santum facere, taliter fit in iustificatione impii; secundo modo sanctificare hoc est sanctum in sanctitate confirmare, et hoc factum fuit in Apostolis; tertio modo iam sanctum et confirmatum manifestare, et sic est intelligendum de Christo, et sic accipit Magister. Et secundum aliquem trium* etc. usque *ad quem*.

[5] In the Vatican edition and codex cc there is badly lacking *because* [quia], which, however, is extant in the other codices and edition 1.
[6] Here in ch. 1. — Then from the more ancient manuscripts and edition 1, we have substituted *of proceeding* [procedendi] for the less apt *of producing* [producendi], then after *conform manner of proceeding* [modus procedendi conformis] we have deleted the particle *and* [et], and a little below this in place of *incidentally* [incidentaliter] we have put *in passing* [incidenter].
[7] Codex dd has *declaration* [declarationem].
[8] Trusting in the manuscripts and edition 1 we have supplied *three* [trium].
[9] Codex dd exhibets the solution of this doubt thus: *I respond, it must be said, that “to sanctify” is “to understand” in a threefold manner: in the first manner it is “to make (something) holy from a not holy”, such as comes to be in the justificatino of the impius; in the secondmanner “to sanctify this” is “to confirm (something) holy in holiness”, and this was done in the Apostles; in the third manner “to manifest (something) already holy and confirmed”,*

and in this manner it must be understood of Christ, and thus does Master (Peter) accept it. And according to any of these three etc. up to *terminus to which*.

_p. 254_

Spiritu sancto: *Et ipse est virtus, quae de illo exibat*. Videtur enim male dicere, quia aut *virtus* accipiatur proprie, aut appropriate. Primo modo *non*, constat; secundo modo *non*, videtur, quia primae ad Corinthios primo[1] dicimus *Christum Dei virtutem et Dei sapientiam* etc.

the Holy Spirit: *And He is the virtue, which used to go forth from Him*. For he seems to speak badly, because either *virtue* is accepted properly, or in an appropriated manner. *Not* In the first manner, it is established; *not* in the second manner, it seems, because according to the first (chapter)[1] of the First (Letter) to the Corinthians, we say *Christ the Virtue of God and the Wisdom of God* etc..

Ad hoc potest dici, quod Spiritui sancto non appropriator *virtus* simpliciter, sed *virtus sanativi*, et hoc, quia gratia sanitatum est donum Spiritus sancti,[2] et gratia eius est medicina ipsius animae; sed Filio appropriatur *virtus operandi*, quia *omnia per ipsum facta sunt*.[3]

To this it can be said, that to the Holy Spirit *virtue* is not appropriated simply (speaking), but *sanative virtue* (is), and this, because the grace of health [gratia sanitatum] is a gift of the Holy Spirit,[2] and His grace is the medicine of the soul itself; but to the Son *the virtue of working* is appropriated, because *all (things) have been made through Him*.[3]

Aliter potest dici, quod *virtus* habet comparationem ad illud *ad*[4] *quod* est, et sic tenet rationem principii; vel ad id *cuius* est, et sic tenet rationem complementi; vel ad *utrumque*, et sic tenet rationem medii. Sicut ergo *ex ipso* appropriatur Patri, *per ipsum* Filio, *in ipso* Spiritui sancto: ita *virtus*, in quantum tenet rationem *principii*, appropriatur Patri, in quantum[5] rationem *medii*, Filio, in quamtum rationem *completionis*, Spiritui sancto; quia completio est in bonitate et delectatione Spiritus sancti, sed hoc infra melius dicetur.[6]

In another manner it can be said, that *virtue* has a comparison to that *for*[4] *which* it is, and in this manner it has the reckoning of a principle; and/or to that *of which* it is, and in this manner it has the reckoning of a complement; and/or to *both*, and in this manner has the reckoning of a means. Therefore just as *from Him* is appropriated to the Father, *through Him* to the Son, *in Him* to the Holy Spirit: so *virtue*, inasmuch as it has the reckoning of *a principle*, is appropriated to the Father, inasmuch as[5] the reckoning of *a means*, to the Son, inasmuch as a reckoning of *completion*, to the Holy Spirit; because there is a completion in the goodness and delectation of the Holy Spirit, but this will be better said below.[6]

Dub. IV.

Item quaeritur de hoc quod dicit, quod post *resurrectionem Dominus Iesus bis dedit Spiritum sanctum*. Videtur enim, quod ter dederit: quia *primo* dedit eis ante passionem, cum dedit eis potestatem eiiciendi daemonia et curare languores, Matthaei decimo.[7] *Item* post resurrectionem, Ioannis vigesimo:[8] *Accipite*

Doubt IV

Likewise is asked of this which he says, that after *the Resurrection the Lord Jesus twice gave the Holy Spirit*. For it seems, that He gave (Him) *thrice*: because *first* He gave (the Holy Spirit) to them before the Passion, when He gave them the power of casting forth demons and to cure illnesses, according to the tenth (chapter) of (St.)

Spiritum sanctum. *Item* post ascensionem, Actuum secundo.[9] Ergo insufficienter enumerat Augustinus.

Matthew.[7] *Likewise* after the Resurrection, according to the twentieth (chapter) of (St.) John:[8] *Accept the Holy Spirit*. *Likewise* after the Ascension, according to the second (chapter) of Acts.[9] Therefore (St.) Augustine insufficiently enumerates (them).

Respondeo: Ad praesens dicendum, quod possunt numerari dationes Spiritus sancti quatum ad *actum et effectum*; et sic enumerat Rabanus,[10] et fuerunt tres, quia ter dedit et quia ad tria dedit: *primo* ad miraculorum operationem; *secundo* ad peccatorum absolutionem; *tertio* ad infidelium conversionem. Possunt etiam alio modo numerari quantum ad *locum et significationem*; et sic dedit bis, scilicet in terra et in caelo; item[11] in *terra* ad commendandum praeceptum dilectionis ad proximum, in *caelo* ad commendandum afffectum dilectionis ad Deum, et sic patet controveria.[12]

I respond: To the present it must be said, that the giving [dationes] of the Holy Spirit can be numbered as much as regards *act and effect*, and in this manner Rabanus (Maurus) enumerates (them),[10] and there were three, because He gave thrice and because He gave for three: *first* for the working of miracles; *second* for the absolution of sins; *third* for the conversion of unbelievers. They can also in another manner be numbered as much as regards *place and signification*; and in this manner He gave twice, namely on Earth and in Heaven; likewise[11] on *Earth* to command the precept of the love for neighbor, in *Heaven* to command the affection of love for God, and thus the controversy is clear.[12]

Dub. V.

Doubt V

Item quaeritur de illo verbo Apostoli: *Unum Spiritum potavimus*; quo tropo dictum est in hoc? Et videtur, quod conveniat magis Filio, quia Ecclesiastici decimo quinto[13] dicitur: *Aqua sapientiae salutaris*, et Proverbiorum nono:[14] *Venite, bibite vinum*; et hoc dicit ipsa Sapientia, scilicet Dei Filius: ergo etc.

Likewise is asked of that word of the Apostle: *We have drunk of the one Spirit*; in what trope has this been said? And it seems, that it befits the Son more, because in the fifteenth (chapter) of Ecclesiasticus there is said:[13] *The water of saving wisdom*, and in the ninth (chapter) of Proverbs:[14] *Come, drink the wine*; and this Wisdom Itself says, that is, the Son of God: therefore etc..

Respondeo: Dicendum, quod Spiritus sanctus dicitur *potus*, in quantum saecularis sitis restringit[15] ardorem. Hoc autem appropriatur Spiritui sancto, quia, sicut dicit Gregorius,[16] « gustato Spiritu, desipit omnis caro ». In quantum autem per potum est delegatio nutrimenti ad singula membra, sic appropriatur Filio, cuius est prudentia et sapientia appropriatum, quae quodam modo habent vim regitivam et ordinativam pastus omnibus viribus animae.[17]

I respond: It must be said, that the Holy Spirit is said (to be) *drink*, inasmuch as He restrains[15] the ardor of thirst for the age. But this (term) is appropriated to the Holy Spirit, because, just as (Pope St.) Gregory (the Great) says,[16] « having tasted the Spirit, all flesh looses its taste ». But inasmuch as through drinking there is a transfer for the nutriment [delegation nutrimenti] of each member, so it is appropriated to the Son, the appropriated of which is prudence and wisdom, which in a certain manner have a regulative and ordinative force for feeding every power of the soul.[17]

Dub. VI.

Doubt VI

Item obiicitur de alio verbo:[18] *Caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris*. Videtur enim impro- / -prie dictum, . . .

Likewise is objected concerning the other word (of the Apostle):[18] *The charity of God has been poured forth* [diffusa] *in our*

hearts. For it seems that it has been improperly / said. . .

[1] Vers. 24.
[2] I. Cor. 12, 9.
[3] Ioan. 1, 3.
[4] Ex plurimis mss. et ed. 1 restituimus *ad*, quod male omittit Vat., quae est paulo ante post *virtus* addit *vel*.
[5] Codd. cum ed. 1 omittunt *tenet*, quod Vat. hic repetit, et paulo infra unus alterque cod. ut O V cum ed. 1 ponit *dilectione* pro *delectatione*.
[6] Dist. 34. q. 3, ubi de nominum appropriatione in communi, et d. 32. a. 2. q. ad ult., ubi de huius nominis *virtutis* appropriatione in speciali. — Plura de appropriatione verbi Apostoli *ex ipso* etc. vide infra d. 36. dub. 4. et Alex. Hal. S. p. I. q. 67. m. 4.
[7] Vers. 1.
[8] Vers. 22.
[9] Vers. 2-4. — Verba Augustini vide hic in lit. Magistri, c. 1.
[10] In Glossa ordinaria ad Act. 2, 2. haec leguntur: « Ante passionem datus est Apostolis Spiritus ad gratiam doctrinae et sanitatum; post resurrectionem insufflavit Iesus Spiritum et ait: Accipite Spiritum sanctum, quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis etc. . . . In Pentecoste de caelo missus est Spiritus, ut qui in proximo debebant dividi acciperent linguarum notitiam, ne per mundum euntes interpretibus indigerent. Et quia Deus simplex est natura, semel de caelo datur Spiritus; propter homines vero, qui duplici constant substantia, corpore scil. et anima, dupliciter est diligendus. In tertia bis datur, prius in efficacia signorum ad sanitates corporum, postea indulgentiam peccatorum ad remedia animarum ». Haec verba in ed. operum Lyrani (Venet. 1588.), loc. cit., Rabano attribuuntur. — Idem textus Rabani occurit infra d. 15. p. II. q. 1. et Comment. in Ioan. c. 20, 25. (Supplem. Bonelii, t. 1).
[11] Aliqui codd. ut H aa bb ff cum ed. 1 omittunt *item*, pro quo cod. K ponit *ratio significationis*. Mox ed. 1 pro *in caelo* ponit *de caelo*, quod magis correspondet verbis Augustini a Magistro hic c. 1. relatis; et Glossae ordinariae, Act. 2, 2: « *De caelo* datur Spiritus, ut diligantur Deus; *in terra*, ut diligatur proximus. Bis enim post resurrectionem est datus ad duo praecepta caritatis commendanda »; (cfr. paulo supra alium textum glossae citatum).
[12] Hoc dubium solvit B. Albert., hic a. 12.
[13] Vers. 3.
[14] Vers. 5.
[15] Vat. contra fere omnes codd. et ed. 1 *restringuit*, mox falso *Hic* loco *Hoc*.
[16] Verba ista non sunt *Gregorii*, sed *Bernardi*, qui Epistol. 111. ad parentes suos ait: Gustato spiritu necesse est desipere carnem.
[17] De hoc dubio vide B. Albert., hic a. 14.
[18] Supple cum cod. dd *Apostoli*.

[1] Verse 24.
[2] 1 Cor. 12:9.
[3] John 1:3.
[4] From very many manuscripts and edition 1, we have restored the *for* [ad], which the Vatican edition badly omits, which edition a little before this after *virtue* [virtus] adds *either* [vel].
[5] The codices together with edition 1 omit the *has* [tenet], which the Vatican edition here repeats, and a little below this one or the other codex, such as O and V, together with edition 1 have *love* [dilectione] for *delectation* [delectatione].
[6] Distinction 34, q. 3, where it concerns the appropriation of names in common, and d. 32, a. 2, last question, where it concerns the appropriation of this name *virtue* in special. — For more on the appropriation of the Apostle's word *from Him*, etc. see below in d. 36, dubium 4, and Alexander of Hales, Summa, p. I, q. 67, m. 4.
[7] Verse 1.
[8] Verse 22.
[9] Verses 2-4. — See the words of (St.) Augustine here in the text of Master (Peter), ch. 1.
[10] In the Glossa Ordinaria on Acts 2 :2 these words are read : « Before the Passion the Holy Spirit was given to the Apostles for the grace of doctrine and healing [sanitatum]; after the Resurrection Jesus breathed the Spirit upon (them) and said: Accept the Holy Spirit, whose sins you shall forgive, are forgiven them etc. . . . On Pentecost the Spirit was send from Heaven, so that those who were to be divided on the morrow would accept the knowledge of tongues, lest they be in need of interpreters as they went forth throughout the world. And because God is simple in nature, the Spirit was given once from Heaven; but for the sake of men, who are composed of a twofold substance, namely of body and soul, He is to be loved in a twofold manner. In the third (giving) He is given twice, first in the efficacy of signs for the healing of bodies, afterwards unto the indulgence of sins for the remedy of souls ». These words in the edition of the Opera of (Nicholas) of Lyra (Venice 1588), loc. cit., are attributed to Rabanus (Maurus). — The same text of Rabanus occurs below in d. 15, p. II, q. 1, and in the Commentary on St. John, 20:25 (Bonelli's Supplement.).
[11] Some codices, such as H aa bb and ff, together with edition 1 omit *likewise* [Item], in place of which codex K puts *the reckoning of signification* [ratio significationis]. Then edition 1 in place of *in Heaven* [in caelo] puts *from Heaven* [de caelo], which corresponds more to the words of (St) Augustine, related by Master (Peter) here in ch. 1; and to those of the Glossa Ordinaria, Acts 2:2 : « *From Heaven* the Spirit is given, so that they might love God; *on Earth*, that they might love neighbor. For twice after the Resurrection was he given to command the two precepts of charity », (cf. a little above this, the other text of the Gloss cited.
[12] This doubt is solved by Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 12.

[13] Verse 3.
[14] Verse 5.
[15] The Vatican edition, contrary to nearly all the codices and edition 1, has *restrained* [restringuit], then falsely *here it* [Hic] for *this (term)* [Hoc].
[16] These words are not (St.) Gregory's, but (St.) Bernard 's, who in his Epistle 111 to his own parents says: Having tasted the spirit it is necessary to loose the taste for the flesh.
[17] On this doubt, see Bl. (now St.) Albertus (Magnus), here in a. 14.
[18] Supply with codex dd. *of the Apostle* [Apostoli].

---

impro- / -prie dictum, quia quod *diffusum* est, dispersum est, et virtus dispersa minor est: si ergo caritas potens est, non ergo debet dicit *diffusa*.

RESPONDEO: Dicendum quod, *infundi* et *diffundi* proprie dicitur humoris. Ipsa autem caritas humori comparatur, quia sicut arbor fomentum et vitam et viriditatem habet ab humore, sic tota spiritualis machina ab amore. Iste autem amor *infunditur*, in quantum intra[1] recipitur; *diffunditur* vero, in quantum ex intimis procedens dilatat affectum ad dilectionem multorum et movet omnes animae vires ad bonas operationes. « Operatur enim magna, si est, si vero operari renuit, amor non est », sicut dicit Gregorius.[2] Et ideo Dominus dicit Ioannis septimo:[3] *Flumina de ventre eius fluent aquae vivae*. — Quod ergo dicitur quod minuitur; dicendum, quod verum est in his quae habent ortum ab origine deficiente,[4] sicut est in puteis, in quibus non vivit aqua. Sed caritas habet originem indeficientem, sicut fluvius.[5]

said, because what has been *diffused*, has been dispersed, and a virtue dispersed is lesser: therefore if charity is potent, it ought, therefore, not be said (to be) *diffused*.

I RESPOND: It must be said, that *to infuse* and *to diffuse* are properly said of a humor. Moreover charity itself is compared to a humor, because just as a tree has branches [fomentum] and life and greenness [viriditatem] from a humor, so the whole spiritual machine (does) from love. Moreover this love *is infused*, inasmuch as it is received within;[1] but *is diffused*, inasmuch as one proceeding from what is most interior it dilates the affection for a love of the many and moves all the powers of the soul to good operations. « For it works great things, if it is, but if it refuses to work, it is not love », just as (St.) Gregory says.[2] And for that reason the Lord says in the seventh (chapter) of (St.) John:[3] *Rivers of living water flow from His bosom*. — Because, therefore, there is said that it is lessened; it must be said, that it is true among those which have rise from a failing origin;[4] just as in cisterns, in which water is not living. But charity has an unfailing origin, just as a river (does).[5]

---

[1] Nonnulli codd. ut T V W X *intus*.
[2] Homil. 30. in Evang. n. 2.
[3] Vers. 38.
[4] Praeferimus lectionem codd. L O *deficiente* loco *deficiendi*, quia et in se verior est et cum subnexis conformior.
[5] Egregie de hoc loquitur S. Doctor in Comment. in Ioan. c. 8, 39 (Suppl. Bonelli, tom. I. col. 735.).

[1] Not a few codices, such as T V W and X, have *inwardly* [intus].
[2] Homily 20 on the Gospel, n. 2.
[3] Verse 38.
[4] We prefer the reading of codices L and O *from a failing origin* [ab origine deficiente] in place of *from an origin of failing* [ab origine deficiendi], because it is also more true in itself and is more conformable with the subjoined.
[5] The Seraphic Doctor speaks of this more extensively in his Commentary on the Gospel of St. John, 8:39 (Bonelli's, Supplement, tome I, col. 735).

 The / symbol is used to indicate that the text which follows appears on the subsequent page of the Quaracchi Edition. The translation of the notes in English corresponds to the context of the English text, not that of the Latin text; likewise they are a freer translation than that which is necessitated by the body of the text. Items in square [ ] brackets contain Latin terms corresponding to the previous English word(s), or notes added by the English translator. Items in round ( ) brackets are terms implicit in the Latin syntax or which are required for clarity in English.